MAN, SIN, AND SALVATION

Rev. Principal
ROBERT S. FRANKS, M.A

Class 234Q Book F855
General Theological Seminary Library
Chelsea Square, New York

PRESENTED BY
Soc'y for Promoting Religion and Learning


Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/newtestamentdoct0000rsfr

CENTURY BIBLE HANDBOOKS

List of the Volumes Issued and in Preparation

THE BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.
By Rev. Prof. OWEN C. WHITEHOUSE, M.A., D.D.

THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.
By Rev. Prof. G. CURRIE MARTIN, M.A., B.D.

*APOCRYPHAL BOOKS (OLD TESTAMENT AND NEW TESTAMENT).
By Rev. Prof. H. T. ANDREWS, M.A.

HISTORY OF ANCIENT ISRAEL.
By Rev. Prof. W. H. BENNETT, M.A., D.D., Litt.D.

THE RELIGION OF ISRAEL.
By Prof. PEAKE, M.A., D.D.

*LIFE AND TEACHING OF JESUS CHRIST.
By Rev. W. B. SELBIE, M.A.

ST. PAUL (LIFE AND TEACHING).
By Rev. Principal A. E. GARVIE, M.A., D.D.

ST. JOHN AND OTHER NEW TESTAMENT TEACHERS.
By Rev. Prof. A. L. HUMPHRIES, M.A.

*THE EARLY CHURCH.
By Rev. R. F. HORTON, M.A., D.D.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINE OF CHRIST.
By Rev. Principal ADENEY, M.A., D.D.

*THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINES OF MAN SIN, AND SALVATION.
By Rev. ROBERT S. FRANKS, M.A., B.Litt.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS.
By Rev. Prof. ROBERT MACKINTOSH, M.A., D.D.

* Issued June 1908.

CENTURY BIBLE HANDBOOKS

General Editor

Principal WALTER F. ADENEY, M.A., D.D.

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINES OF MAN, SIN, AND SALVATION

THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCTRINES OF

MAN, SIN, AND SALVATION

BY

R. S. FRANKS, M.A., B.Litt.

SOMETIME SCHOLAR OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE; THEOLOGICAL LECTURER AT THE FRIENDS' SETTLEMENT FOR RELIGIOUS AND SOCIAL STUDY, WOODBROOKE, BIRMINGHAM

LONDON
T. C. & E. C. JACK
16 HENRIETTA STREET, W.C.
AND EDINBURGH
1908

234Q
F855

65834

NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

N 14 '19

PREFACE

THE special lines, upon which this short treatise is written, are as follows :—

1. The delineation of the New Testament doctrines of Man, Sin, and Salvation is based upon a statement of the corresponding doctrines in the Old Testament and later Jewish writings. The New Testament conceptions are so rooted in this previous thought, that they are not clearly intelligible without a knowledge of it.

2. The guiding thread, which is followed in the whole presentation, is the history of the doctrine of salvation. Without a doctrine of salvation religion cannot exist. It is, however, possible to have a doctrine of salvation apart from the idea of sin, as is the case in the earliest Hebrew religion. And a doctrine of salvation from sin may exist with little or no explicit doctrine of sin, as is the case with many New Testament writers. A doctrine of man is still less always to be found explicitly developed.

3. Special attention is devoted to the question of the future or eschatological salvation. This corresponds to the importance which the idea of the future salvation possesses in the actual history of the doctrine. It is by passing through the eschatological stage that the idea of salvation becomes spiritualised.

4. The arrangement followed in the presentation of the Old Testament doctrine is based upon the generally accepted principles of Old Testament criticism. For the order of the later Jewish literature I have followed the article "Eschatology" by Charles in the "Encyclopædia Biblica," to which I would here express my deep obligation. As regards the New Testament, the arrangement is based upon the following principles:—

(*a*) The teaching of Jesus is first dealt with upon the basis of the Synoptic Gospels.

(*b*) This is followed by a view of the doctrine of primitive Jewish Christianity, founded upon the speeches of Peter in Acts.

(*c*) After this follows the doctrine of Paul, based upon those epistles now very widely agreed upon as his. The Pastoral Epistles, as being too uncertainly Pauline, are left over.

(*d*) The doctrine of the remaining New Testament

writings, excepting the Gospel and Epistles of John, but including the Pastoral Epistles, is next introduced, these writings being regarded as representing the common Christianity of the early Church contemporary with and subsequent to Paul, and as partly preserving the lines of the primitive Jewish Christianity, partly showing the influence of Paulinism, and partly developing along fresh lines of their own.

(*e*) Last of all, the doctrine of the Gospel and Epistles of John is treated, representing the re-statement of the teaching of Jesus in the light of the whole later development of doctrine, and thus completing the history.

R. S. FRANKS.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
I.	THE OLD TESTAMENT	1
II.	THE LATER JUDAISM	28
III.	THE TEACHING OF JESUS ACCORDING TO THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS	42
IV.	THE SPEECHES OF PETER IN THE ACTS	78
V.	THE THEOLOGY OF PAUL	80
VI.	THE PASTORAL EPISTLES	137
VII.	I. PETER	141
VIII.	HEBREWS	146
IX.	THE APOCALYPSE	154
X.	THE EPISTLE OF JAMES	157
XI.	JUDE AND II. PETER	160
XII.	THE GOSPEL AND EPISTLES OF JOHN	162
	INDEX	180

MAN, SIN, AND SALVATION

CHAPTER I

THE OLD TESTAMENT

§ 1. THE IDEAS OF SALVATION AND SIN IN EARLY HEBREW RELIGION

THE primary idea of salvation in the Old Testament is that of present deliverance from all the ills and troubles of the world. We find the idea in the earliest stage of Old Testament history, and it continues throughout its progress, though other conceptions are superimposed and become more prominent. Yahweh, the national God of Israel, saves His people out of all their calamities and distresses (I. Sam. x. 19). In the notion of Yahweh as the Saviour of Israel are implied (*a*) the idea of His power to help or save, and (*b*) His interest in and goodwill towards His people.

Since the chief danger imperilling the national

existence was that of enemies, Yahweh appears especially as the deliverer of Israel from national foes. If He saves His people through a human representative (I. Sam. ix. 16; Judges iii. 9, 15), He is still Himself the true Saviour of His people (II. Sam. iii. 18).

The idea of salvation we are considering is, however, not merely a negative one, not merely that of deliverance from ills and troubles. It implies also the idea of the safety, security, and welfare into which Yahweh by His deliverance brings His people. From this point of view salvation or deliverance is practically synonymous with prosperity (Ps. cxviii. 25).

In the salvation of the nation is included that of the individual. He in the earliest idea is chiefly regarded as a part of the nation, who shares in its good or ill fortune, to whom, therefore, the deliverance and prosperity of the nation means his own deliverance and prosperity. This, however, does not preclude the particular help of Yahweh towards an individual in special circumstances (I. Sam. xxiv. 15). But Yahweh's first concern is with His people: only secondarily does He concern Himself with its individual members.

In general, salvation is confidently expected from the national God. Yahweh's normal goodwill towards

Israel is, however, liable to vicissitudes. For a season He may be wroth, and His power, instead of being manifested in the deliverance of His people, may be shown in their discomfiture. This wrath of Yahweh is dread and terrible, and it is sometimes manifested for no apparent cause (II. Sam. xxiv. 1). Most frequently, however, the wrath of Yahweh is due to sin, either the sin of the whole nation, or of some individual member or members of it. Sin is the transgression of the will of Yahweh, which will in general is made known in the religious and social order of His people.

Yahweh manifests His displeasure against sin by the sending of calamities (II. Sam. xxi. 1; Judges iii. 8). In view of the solidarity of the nation, the sin of an individual may be visited upon the nation (Josh. vii. 1): a special visitation, however, may overtake the individual and his family (I. Kings xvi. 34). Future generations, whether of the nation or of a particular house, may also suffer for the sin of their ancestors (Exod. xx. 5).

In these cases, where Yahweh's anger is due to sin, the calamities that follow from it are the *punishment* of the sin. Yahweh does not, however, always punish sin. He may withhold His anger, either for a time or altogether. He may overlook or forgive the sin. To

this end intercession is made to Him (Gen. xx. 7), or propitiatory sacrifices are offered (II. Sam. xxiv. 25), or, again, the national guilt is purged by the cutting off of the guilty member from the people (Josh. vii. 25). In such cases Yahweh may relent from His wrath, and again become the Saviour of His people, things being thus restored to their normal condition.

§ 2. THE DAY OF YAHWEH

In the period of the divided kingdom there seems further to have been added to the primary conception of present salvation, the idea of a future salvation. During the struggles of Israel with the foreign powers round about, it appeared sometimes as if Yahweh had ceased to be the Saviour of His people; nor did the national conscience accuse itself of sin against Him as the cause of His displeasure. On the contrary, all the rites of religion were punctiliously observed, sacrifices were abundantly offered (Amos iv. 4, 5, v. 21–23), and the people found no reason for the loss of Divine favour. In spite of all appearances to the contrary, they felt sure that Yahweh, the God of Hosts, was with them (Amos v. 14). Their confidence in Yahweh's

help expressed itself, therefore, in the idea that He would soon signally intervene on their behalf, rout all their enemies, and establish the nation in complete security and prosperity. This future day of salvation was pregnantly called the day of Yahweh (Amos v. 18).

§ 3. THE RELIGION OF THE PRE-EXILIC PROPHETS

We have first of all to notice here an enlargement and deepening of the idea of God. In the teaching of the great pre-exilic prophets from Amos onward, Yahweh ceases to be simply the national God of Israel, and becomes a God of absolute righteousness, who, while He is the God of Israel, judges His own people upon the same terms as other nations (Amos iii. 2, ix. 7, 8). By this change in the idea of God all other points in religion are affected. The conception of sin in particular is deepened. Sin continues to be, as before, a transgression of the will of God; but as the conception of God is now that of a God of absolute righteousness, who demands nothing short of righteousness (Amos v. 24), a severer standard is applied to the judgment of human actions. The moral law in the fullest sense is now applied steadily in the

estimation of sin: *cp.* Is. v. 7, as interpreted in detail by the remainder of the chapter. It would be a mistake, however, to identify the prophetic idea of sin simply with that of the transgression of the moral law. The religious offences of rebellion against God (Isa. i. 2), distrust of Him (Isa. vii. 11–13), ingratitude towards Him (Hos. ii. 5–13), are also equally emphasised by the prophets, and in Jeremiah especially (followed here by Ezekiel) the sin of idolatry, the turning from Yahweh to false gods, appears as the sin of sins (Jer. xi. 10; Ezek. xvi.). Offences against the laws of ritual, however, which in the older Hebrew religion were especially thought of as bringing down the wrath of Yahweh (II. Sam. vi. 7), with the prophets from Amos to Jeremiah sink into the background. Their attitude towards ritual is summed up in Hosea's great word, "I desire mercy and not sacrifice" (Hos. vi. 6).

The idea of the righteousness of Yahweh profoundly affects also that of the punishment of sin. The connection between the punishment and His righteousness is clearly brought out. The idea, moreover, of a wrath which is incalculable and inexplicable disappears in favour of the regular connection of sin and calamity. Calamities are regarded by the prophets invariably as

the punishment of sin, and the only way which they recognise for their removal is that of repentance (Amos v. 14; Hos. xiv. 1; Isa. i. 18–20).

In the teaching of the pre-exilic prophets, the popular doctrine of the day of Yahweh undergoes a remarkable change. It appears no longer as a day when Yahweh will manifest Himself in the destruction of Israel's enemies, but rather as a day when He will judge and punish His own people for their sins (Amos v. 18; Isa. ii. 12–17).

Beyond, however, this day of judgment the prophets set the hope of a future salvation, in which Yahweh will show Himself all that His people had hoped for, and yet more still. The fundamental outlines of this hope are those of a restored kingdom, in which the security and prosperity hoped for by Israel shall be realised, but with the important addition, in harmony with the fundamental doctrine of the prophets, that the restored kingdom shall be one of righteousness under the sovereignty of the righteous God. From the first, however, there was a variety of representation as to how the sovereignty of God was to be exercised in it. Sometimes we have the idea of a human representative or representatives of God, through whom His salvation is

mediated (Isa. i. 28, ix. 1–7, xi. 1–9, xxxv. 1–5); sometimes we have the conception of the immediate sovereignty of God in His kingdom (Isa. iv. 2–6). The idea, therefore, of a single representative of God, or Messiah, as ruler of the kingdom, is not absolutely essential to the notion of the kingdom. It is better, then, to speak of the hope of the kingdom of God than of the Messianic hope, though the latter phraseology has become usual.

§ 4. JEREMIAH

So far we have spoken of the pre-exilic prophets as a whole. It is now necessary, however, to turn to Jeremiah in particular, and to consider certain ideas of his, which profoundly modified the conceptions both of sin and salvation. In the first place Jeremiah goes back from the idea of sins as single acts of transgression against the will of Yahweh to the conception of "sin in the heart" as the root and ground of individual transgressions. He establishes the notion of sinful habit or disposition. The sinful disposition characterises Israel as a nation (Jer. vii. 24, xi. 8, xvi. 12, xviii. 12). But in accordance with this deeper idea of sin in the heart, it follows that Jeremiah regards not merely the nation

but the individual in his teaching. He finds the same sinful disposition in the individual Israelite, and calls not only the nation but individuals to repentance (Jer. xviii. 11, xxv. 5; xxxv. 15). Then, in the next place, Jeremiah shows the necessary consequences of this idea of sin in his conception of salvation. He first clearly defines salvation as salvation from sin itself, from the sinful habit and disposition, and thus grounds the righteousness of the promised kingdom in a change of heart in its individual members. This idea recurs in Ezekiel (see Jer. xxxi. 33; Ezek. xxxvi. 28). It is noteworthy that the forgiveness of sins is now specially mentioned as a blessing of the future salvation (see Jer. xxxi. 34).

This attention to the individual, however, raises a problem. How far is the individual involved in the lot of the nation? Can the nation be lost, and the individual delivered? It was felt by the men of Jeremiah's time to reflect upon the righteousness of God, of which the prophets spoke so much, that they should be involved in the fate of the nation, suffering, as they felt, not for their own sins but for those of their fathers (Jer. xxxi. 9). In answer to this doubt, Jeremiah sets forth the idea of an immediate individual retribution apart from the future salvation of the nation (Jer. xxxi. 30).

This notion of individual retribution is further developed by Ezekiel. The individual prospers or suffers purely according to his own righteousness or unrighteousness. This is simply the ordinary prophetic idea of God's righteous judgment applied to the individual (see Ezek. iii. 16–21, xviii. 1–32).

§ 5. THE LAW: DEUTERONOMY AND THE PRIESTLY CODE

In the legal development, which beginning in the time of the prophets runs parallel with that of prophecy, we have a similar application of the prophetic idea of God's righteousness in regard to the national salvation. Deuteronomy differs from the prophecy, to which in part it owes its origin, in taking an optimistic view of the possibility of reform in the nation. It does not expect national prosperity after a judgment as the result of the free grace of Yahweh; but it is rather founded on the idea that Israel, by properly performing the demands of Yahweh, may obtain prosperity at His hand, though of course failure to perform His demands must bring punishment and national ruin. Compare the illustration of this principle in the great blessing

and curse of Deut. xxvii., xxviii. It is to be observed further that Deuteronomy includes in the demands of Yahweh the ritual precepts handed down by tradition, which the prophets, at any rate as far as Jeremiah, set light by. An important conception, which is developed in Deuteronomy, is that of "righteousness before God," which consists in the performance of His precepts, and which entitles Israel to His salvation. This idea is applied both to the nation and the individual (Deut. vi. 25, xxiv. 13).

In the priestly code the idea of a legal saving institution is continued; but the end of the law as salvation is not so much emphasised as in Deuteronomy. The chief new points, however, to be observed are the co-ordination of the law under the point of view of holiness, and the place here given to expiatory sacrifice. The fundamental notion of holiness is that of separation, the separation of all that belongs to religion from all that is secular; and the priestly code is governed by the idea that Israel is to be a holy people to Yahweh, separated from the heathen by the observance of His precepts (Lev. xx. 26). Special importance thus attaches to the ceremonial precepts, which far more than in Deuteronomy come into the foreground in this later

law-book (Lev. xx. 24, 25). The priestly code is therefore full of the idea of sin as transgression of the ceremonial law. It, however, contains an elaborate saving institution of expiatory sacrifice, in which the old conception of expiatory sacrifice is applied in detail to various offences (see Lev. i.–vii.). (It is to be observed that in one instance expiatory sacrifice is mentioned in Deuteronomy: see Deut. xxi. 1–9.) According to the priestly code, however, only sins of ignorance can be expiated by sacrifice. Sins committed with a high hand can only be purged by cutting off the offender from the people (Num. xv. 28, 30).

It is useless to look for a consistent symbolical explanation of all the details of sacrifice in the priestly code. Its sanctity and atoning power rather here consist in its time-honoured and traditional character; and it is probable that we have in these final laws of Hebrew sacrifice the result of a long development, to which many different ideas have contributed. The following conceptions may here be mentioned as they find expression in different parts of the Old Testament, and have influenced New Testament thought.

1. Sacrifice is conceived as a gift to God (Exod. xxiii. 15. If, then, the gift is intended for the expiation of

sin, it will be a propitiatory gift. "In ancient times the idea prevails, that offences against the holiness of Yahweh can be made good by a gift in recognition of the guilt incurred" (Stade, *Biblische Theologie des alten Testaments*, p. 167).

2. Sacrifice is conceived as a means of communion between God and man, in that the victim furnishes a communion feast, participation in which unites the worshipper to God. In the application of this conception to expiation, we have to say, participation *reunites* the worshipper to God. A special form of the idea of communion with God by participation in the victim is the notion of communion by participation in the blood of the victim. In Hebrew religion this does not, as in other ancient religions, appear in the form of the drinking of the blood (see Ps. xvi. 4), but only in the form of the external application of the blood. A particularly clear case is Exod. xxiv. 5–8, where the blood is applied to the altar (as the representative of God) and to the worshippers, thus uniting both in communion. At bottom of this special connection of the idea of communion with the blood is the mystical conception that the blood is the life (Lev. xvii. 11). Hence participation in the blood of the victim means participation in a common life.

3. Idea of expiation by a substitutionary victim. The notion is that by transgression the sinner has come under the Divine displeasure, and is therefore allowed to offer as a ransom for his life, which is thus endangered, the life of an animal. This conception is well known in religion outside the Old Testament. In the Old Testament itself we find it in Micah vi. 7: "Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul?" It is not certain, however, whether the idea is anywhere implied in the Old Testament ritual of sacrifice. The elements in the ritual, which seem to point to it, are capable of a different explanation.

The ideas of other nations, however, and the passage quoted from Micah, show that the notion of substitution lay close at hand, and might easily connect itself with the legal institutions. It is to be observed that in the regulated private sacrifices of the priestly law (Lev. i.–vii.), including the sin-offering and the guilt-offering, may be traced the care for the present salvation of the individual member of the nation, which we have observed in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The priestly code, then, aims at securing the welfare not only of the nation but of the individual Israelite.

§ 6. EXILIC AND POST-EXILIC PROPHECY

We return to take up the line of development of prophecy, as it continues after Jeremiah. Here the important element is the richly-varied conception of future national deliverance, or the hope of the kingdom of God, which in one form or other dominates the whole later prophecy. The Messiah, as before, is not an invariable feature of the expectation. Here there is no change. Very noteworthy, however, is the alteration in the idea of the judgment, which is to introduce the great salvation. It falls no longer, since the exile, on the nation as a whole, which is conceived by this great calamity fully to have purged its guilt (Isa. xl. 1, 2). The judgment falls rather upon the enemies of Israel (Isa. xliii. 14, xlvii. 1–14, lxiii. 1–6; Zech. i. 18–21), or upon the ungodly element only in the nation (Isa. lxv. 11–15, lxvi. 14–18; Mal. ii. 5, iv. 1). The former conception is to a great extent a reproduction of the popular expectation of the day of Yahweh. But it is a new and important idea of the second Isaiah that this judgment of the enemies of Israel is to be deduced, along with the salvation of Israel, from Yahweh's righteousness. Israel, as the people of the true religion, is righteous,

where the heathen are unrighteous, and thus receives vindication at the hands of the righteous God; or as the prophet says, introducing a noteworthy terminology, is *justified* (Isa. xlv. 25, l. 8; compare xli. 10, 11, liv. 17). It is further observable that thus in Isa. xl.–lv. Yahweh's righteousness and His salvation come to be almost synonymous (compare Isa. xlv. 21, li. 5 f.).

With regard to the nature of the future salvation, as described by the later prophets, some further points require notice. The first is with regard to the position of the heathen after the introductory judgment. While sometimes all the heathen are destroyed completely (Ezek. xxxviii., xxxix.), in other cases the conception is that they remain as servants and tributaries of Israel (Isa. lx. 12, lxi. 5). Yet again we find the idea of the conversion of the heathen to the knowledge of the true God; so that they may share in the blessings of the great salvation (Isa. xlv. 23). Finally in some cases we find a yet wider universalism, where the primacy of Israel disappears in a world-wide kingdom of God (Isa. xix. 24, 25—a late passage). These latter conceptions are, however, rather the exception than the rule.

Before, however, we pass on from the question of Israel and the heathen, we must notice the remarkable

conception of Isa. lii. 13–liii. 12, according to which the salvation of the heathen is viewed not only as flowing from the grace of God, but as mediated by the vicarious sufferings of Israel. Israel, as the servant of Yahweh, bears the sins of the nations, and out of his suffering comes their good. So in the language of the sacrificial ritual it is said of him that his soul is made an offering for sin. It is not, however, exactly the notion of an expiatory victim that we have here: at any rate there is no idea of propitiation. There is rather the suggestion of an ethical interpretation of the sacrificial language. The good of those for whom the servant suffers does not flow simply from the mere fact of his sacrifice, but rather from the moral effect of this on their minds. They are thereby moved to repentance, acknowledging that the sufferings of the servant are due to their sins (Isa. liii. 4–6). (For the general basis of the interpretation of this passage see Peake, "The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament," chap. iii.)

We notice further in the prophecy of the exile and of the period after the exile a tendency to conceive the future national salvation not merely as an elevation of the national life to its highest national capacity but as a state altogether transcending the conditions of ordinary

earthly life, and absolutely miraculous (Isa. lxv. 4–25). This is in connection with a more transcendent idea of God than is in general found in the earlier prophets. The way here is led by the second Isaiah, to whom Yahweh is above all the omnipotent Creator, who sits upon the circle of the heavens, and to whom men are as grasshoppers (Isa. xl. 22). The conception is again powerfully expressed in the later passage (Isa. lxvi. 1 f.): the heaven is Yahweh's throne, the earth the footstool of His feet; no house built with hands can be worthy of Him.

The further description of the future salvation in the later prophets repeats the ideas of their predecessors. There is to be the complete forgiveness of sin (Isa. xliii. 25; Zech. xiii. 1), and the outpouring of the Spirit upon the people (Isa. xliv. 3; Joel ii. 28, 29); all the people shall be taught of God (Isa. liv. 13) and shall be righteous (Isa. lx. 21). As regards the last point, however, we have the difference from the early ideal that there is a tendency to substitute for righteousness holiness, which is clearly traceable to the influence of the developing or developed law (see Ezek. xl.–xlviii.; Zech. xiv. 20–21—a late passage).

§ 7. FINAL VIEW OF SALVATION IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

At this point we may now look back and sum up the final conceptions of the Jewish Church as to salvation as a whole—only a very few parts of the Old Testament, yet to be treated of, being excepted as looking beyond its general horizon. The main ideas are two. The first is that of a future salvation for the nation proceeding from the righteousness of God, the reverse side of which is a judgment upon the enemies of His true people, both within or without the community. We may note that the notion is expressed that the condition of the speedy appearance of the national salvation is obedience to Yahweh (Mal. iii. 10–12). The second idea is that of the present salvation of the individual, manifested in Yahweh's just retribution of the righteous with prosperity, the reverse side of which is the present punishment of the wicked.

In the Books of Psalms and Proverbs we see how these conceptions affected and coloured the religious life of the nation and the individual. We see how ardently the national salvation was expected and longed for (Ps. ix. 19, xiv. 7, lxxxv.); how sometimes it was

joyously anticipated (Ps. ii., xcvi.–xcviii.); and how, too, in hours of national distress it seemed long delayed (Ps. xliv., lxxxix.). We see further how the dogma of individual retribution became fully established among the pious (Ps. i., xxxiv., and Proverbs *passim*); though at the same time certain Psalms show how the conflict of it with the facts of experience was by some keenly felt (Ps. xxxvii., xlix., lxxiii.).

It is to be added that we see in the Psalms also how the deeper and more inward view of sin realised by the prophets, and above all by Jeremiah, has become the property of the nation, or at least, of the pious in it. We do not find a new doctrine of sin in the Psalms; but a fuller experimental realisation of its meaning speaks from their pages (Ps. xxxii., li.). Equally also do the Psalms bring to view the deepest and most spiritual aspects of the Old Testament idea of salvation, especially in regard to the individual. If salvation was thought of as prosperity (Ps. cxviii. 25), this prosperity was not valued, at any rate since the time of the prophets, purely for its own sake, but above all as the mark of Divine favour. This notion the Psalms bring clearly to view. Not in God's gifts only, but supremely in Himself, is the satisfaction of the desire of man. The

soul of the idea of salvation is the communion with God therein enjoyed (Ps. xxiii. 1–6, xxvii. 4, xliii. 3, 4, lxv. 4).

§ 8. THE ANTHROPOLOGY OF THE OLD TESTAMENT IN ITS BEARING UPON THE CONCEPTIONS OF SIN AND SALVATION

The original anthropology of the Hebrews had no special connection with the religion of Yahweh, but was, on the contrary, not different from that of primitive tribes in general. To the early Hebrews the constitution of man appeared as a duality. On the one hand was the body, or as the ancient Israelite called it from the animated matter of which it was made, and which was common to man and the animals, the flesh. On the other hand was the "soul" or "spirit," the life-principle inhabiting the flesh. There is considerable difference, indeed, in the connotation of the terms "soul" and "spirit" in early Hebrew psychology. Amongst other things, the terms are associated with different psychical functions, and soul is used, as spirit is not used, to express the personality (see Charles, "Eschatology," "Encyclopædia Biblica," col. 1340). But a real trichotomy there is not: "soul" and

"spirit" alike mean the life-principle, the departure of which from the body involves death.

Psychical functions (in particular, intelligence), were connected with the heart as well as with the soul or spirit; but "heart" never stands, like the other terms, for the life-principle. As regards the connection between the flesh and the soul or spirit, there was not at first the sharp demarcation of ideas which afterwards grew up. Flesh was regarded not as dead, but as animated matter, and "my flesh" may equally with "my soul" represent the whole man.

In the writings of the prophets, however, we begin to find the distinction emphasised between man as flesh, and Yahweh as spirit. This opposition first appears in Isa. xxxi. 3: "The Egyptians are men and not God; and their horses are flesh and not spirit." Here we have the notion, afterwards so fundamental to Jewish religion, of the frailty of man (and beast) as flesh, when compared with Yahweh, who as spirit is exalted above the world. This prophetic point of view is further illustrated by the prophetic narrative of Gen. ii., where we have an account of the creation of man, which brings to view the complete dependence of the life-principle in him from Yahweh. The account is that Yahweh formed man of

dust of the ground, and blew into his nostrils the breath of life; so that man became a living soul. There are, therefore in man *three* elements, soul, body (flesh), and spirit; which last, according to this theory, is the Divine principle which gives life to the soul. This narrative is the first instance of a real trichotomy in the Old Testament. In the later account of the creation of man, given by the priestly writer in Gen. i., the anthropomorphism of the prophetic narrative is abandoned, and the creation of man is traced simply to the fiat of God. Important elements, however, in the priestly representation are, that man is made in the image of God (Gen. i. 21), and that he is appointed to have dominion over the creation (Gen. i. 28).

The influence of these new points of view is seen in all the later Old Testament literature (see especially Ps. viii.). What is above all important to us, however, is the influence of the idea that man is flesh (in opposition to the purely spiritual nature of God), or that he is made of the dust of the earth, upon the conceptions of sin and salvation. Not only is there deduced from the therewith connected idea of his frailty, his need of Divine help, so that a potent appeal to God rises out of man's very weakness (Ps. ciii. 13, 14), but also man's sinfulness is

connected with his being flesh, the idea of physical frailty easily passing over into that of moral weakness (Job. iv. 17, 19).

§ 9. DEATH

The original Hebrew anthropology attributed death to the departure of the soul (Gen. xxxv. 18; I. Kings xvii. 21). Death is not, according to the oldest Hebrew view, nor indeed according to the general view of the Old Testament, the punishment of sin, but is rather the natural lot of man (Job v. 26). Premature death, however, is the punishment of sin (II. Sam. vi. 7; Ps. lv. 23), just as long life is a sign of the favour of Yahweh. So little is death in itself the punishment of sin that even in the future age of salvation men still die. The sign of Yahweh's favour is that they live patriarchal lives. Compare Isa. lxvi. 20–22: a hundred years shall be reckoned the life of a child, or of a sinner prematurely cut off.

The prophetic narrative of the Fall (Gen. iii.), on the other hand, does make death in general, along with the necessity of labour, the punishment of Adam's transgression. This narrative, however, stands quite by itself, and has exercised no influence on the Old Testa-

ment in general. It is only after the completion of the Old Testament that the narrative begins to exercise the very potent influence, which it has ever since maintained, over the doctrine of sin.

§ 10. THE STATE AFTER DEATH

Death, according to the oldest view, is not extinction; but the personality continues to exist in Sheol, or the under-world, in a shadowy state, as the mere phantasm and ghost of the earthly self. This idea has no connection with the religion of Yahweh, but is a survival from an early stage of religion through which the ancestors of the Hebrews must have passed. Accordingly we have the notion that Sheol is beyond the sphere of Yahweh's influence. There are no moral distinctions in Sheol: the good and the bad are alike shades in the under-world (Job iii. 13–19). Nor is communion with Yahweh possible to the shades. His salvation is not for them, but only for the living (Ps. xxx. 9, lxxxviii. 5, 10–12; Isa. xxxviii. 18, 19).

It was not till almost the very close of the history of Old Testament religion that these conceptions were broken through. The causes were three in number. First

must be ranked the breaking down of the dogma of individual retribution in the present life, which was seen to conflict with actual experience. The righteous man unvindicated in this life postulates a vindication in the life to come (Job xix. 25, 26). The second cause of the change was the desire of individual piety for communion with God after death, and the growing sense that the communion enjoyed in this life cannot end with death (Ps. lxxiii. 23–26). Finally we have to allow for the desire of the individual for a share in the national salvation. It is to be observed that in the Old Testament no complete synthesis of the national and individual salvation is arrived at, but each stands separately by itself. We have, indeed, the relative synthesis involved in the notion that the judgment which introduces the national salvation will fall not only upon the external enemies of Israel, but upon the wicked in Israel, thus separating the wheat from the chaff (Ps. i. 4–6). But it is evident that this synthesis takes no account of those who die before the national salvation is realised, and is therefore incomplete. The result is that towards the close of the Old Testament literature, there appears the idea of a resurrection of the pious in order to share in the national

salvation. This is found in Isa. xxvi. 1–19, dated by Cheyne in 334 B.C. (see Charles, "Eschatology," in "Encyclopædia Biblica," col. 1384).

The only other passage in the Old Testament which speaks of a resurrection is Dan. xii. 2 (168 B.C.). The resurrection here, however, is not a resurrection of the righteous, but also of the wicked, who are to rise to receive their reward (viz. shame and everlasting contempt). It is not, however, all the righteous or all the wicked that are to rise again, but many—apparently the pre-eminently good, and the pre-eminently bad, in Israel.

CHAPTER II

THE LATER JUDAISM

§ 1. IDEAS OF SALVATION, INDIVIDUAL AND NATIONAL

THE synthesis just begun in the Old Testament is completed in the literature between the Old and New Testaments, in that important part of it known as the "apocalyptic" literature, to which, indeed, such parts of the Old Testament as Isa. xxiv.–xxvii. and Daniel logically belong, though from their position in the Old Testament they have already been mentioned. The peculiar feature of apocalypse is that the advent of the kingdom of God is regarded not merely as the opening of a new period in the history of the world but as the introduction of a new world altogether, a point of view which indeed already appears in Isa. lxv. 17 (date uncertain).

The resurrection further becomes a regular feature in the expectation of the kingdom of God, and

tends more and more to become a general resurrection, while the judgment associated with the coming of the kingdom of God becomes a general judgment. There is, however, much variation in the individual representations as to who rise and who are judged. The completest synthesis of the national and individual salvation is found in the writings of the second century B.C. The righteous, both living and dead, find complete satisfaction in the eternal kingdom of God, established on the earth with its centre at Jerusalem. Its members eat of the tree of life and enjoy patriarchal lives (Enoch i.–xxxvi., before 170; see especially xxv. 3 f.). A somewhat different picture of the future kingdom is given in Enoch lxxxiii.–xc. (166–101 B.C.). Here there is a new heavenly Jerusalem, where God's true sheep, the righteous, dwell (see especially xc. 29, 34).

In the first century B.C., however, the synthesis thus attained begins to break up. The hope of an abiding kingdom upon the earth is all but abandoned. Hence we have either the idea, as already in Isa. lxv. 17, of a new heaven and a new earth as the scene of the future salvation, to share in which the righteous rise (Enoch xxxvii.–lxx.), or else the idea that the kingdom on earth is but transitory, and that the final destina-

tion of the righteous is not this kingdom, but heaven itself. "Here," says Charles, "the belief in a personal immortality has dissociated itself from the doctrine of the Messianic kingdom, and the synthesis of the eschatologies achieved in the preceding century is anew resolved into its elements" ("Eschatology," col. 1361). This idea of a temporary Messianic kingdom is interesting as the precursor of the Millennium in the Apocalypse of John.

Finally, in the first century A.D., the breach between the eschatologies of the nation and the individual becomes yet wider. The nation has in some cases no blessed future at all, but only the individual, as in the Apocalypse of Baruch (xiii. 1 f.). There is no hope expressed anywhere, in the Apocalypse to which this passage belongs, of a restored Jerusalem.

Where in this period a better future is expected for the nation, it is only one of temporary duration, as in IV. Ezra (II. Esdras) vii. 28. With this temporary kingdom the individual has no real concern. "His interest centres round his own soul, and his world is the after life. The great thought of the Divine kingdom has been surrendered in despair" (Charles, "Eschatology," col. 1366).

We return to consider the nature of the national salvation. It continues to be represented along the lines laid down by the prophets, but with an increased transcendence of experience. This is connected, as before, with a more highly developed transcendence in the conception of God, which marks all the writings of this age (viz. 200 B.C.–100 B.C.). The transcendence of the kingdom appears most plainly in the last century B.C., where the dualism between God and the world causes the general break up of the idea of an earthly kingdom of God, the earth as it is being regarded as unfit for the manifestation of the kingdom (so in Enoch xxxvii.–lxx.). The apocalyptic writers, like the prophets, view the kingdom in general as complete prosperity under the rule of God. Whether a Messiah is or is not included, still continues to be accidental. Thus there is no mention of a Messiah in the second century B.C., except in Enoch lxxxiii.–xc. (compare xc. 37). In the first century B.C. the idea of the Messiah is prominent. "Henceforth the Messiah becomes generally, but not universally, the chief figure in the Messianic kingdom" (Charles, "Eschatology," col. 1366). As to further details, some writers describe the future happiness in physical and even sensuous language (compare

the passage above quoted, Enoch xxv. 3). They develop here, indeed, from certain descriptions of later prophecy (as Isa. lxv. 18–25), which similarly describe the kingdom in physical terms. Other writers, however, following rather the pre-exilic prophets, lay chief stress on the righteousness of the kingdom and its members (Psalms of Solomon, 70–40 B.C.).

The position of the heathen in the Messianic age varies with the apocalyptic writers as with the prophets. In the second century B.C. we find the view that all the heathen are to become righteous and worship God, or that only the hostile heathen are to be destroyed, the rest remaining to serve Israel. In the first century B.C., however, this favourable view of the heathen all but disappears. (For further details see Charles, "Eschatology," as before.)

In the prophets the coming of the kingdom is always expected from the power and grace of God, though the obedience of the people may be a condition of its speedy realisation (Mal. iii. 10). The same view still holds good in the apocalyptic writers. But just as in the second Isaiah this idea is coupled with that of the bringing about of the kingdom by the political triumph of Cyrus, as God's Messiah over Babylon

(Is. xlv. 1–6); so about the Christian era we have a political view of the establishment of the kingdom (that of the Zealots), in which the actual realisation of the kingdom depends on the Messiah's victory over Rome. This view is illustrated by the Psalms of Solomon, already mentioned in another connection. Against the view of the Zealots, however, "an emphatic protest was raised by a strong body of Pharisees, who felt it to be their sole duty to observe the law, leaving it to God to intervene to defend them (Charles, "Eschatology," col. 1372). Instances of this protest are found in the Assumption of Moses and in IV. Ezra. Both points of view, therefore, have to be reckoned with in the time of Jesus.

§ 2. ANTHROPOLOGICAL IDEAS CONNECTED WITH THE FUTURE SALVATION

According to Charles the trichotomy of Gen. ii. seems to have left little mark either on the Old Testament or on the later Jewish literature. Compare, however, Ps. xc. 3, civ. 30, cxlvi. 4, which passages contain the idea that the death of man (and the animals) is due to Yahweh's recalling the spirit which He has given to Himself. In Ecclesiastes, just before the close of

the Old Testament, the further conclusion is drawn that, since death is the return of the spirit to God (xii. 7), there is no life after death (iii. 19, 21, ix. 3, 5, 10). The final form of this scepticism is seen in Sadduceeism.

The most general view in the period we are considering is, however, in no way based on Gen. ii., but is simply the old Hebrew trichotomy, in which body is opposed to soul or spirit. The soul or spirit survives death, and the usual idea is that it passes to Sheol until the resurrection. Moral retribution, however, takes place immediately after death. "Sheol undergoes complete transformation in the second century B.C., and becomes an intermediate place of retribution for the righteous and the wicked. All the dead who died before the final judgment have to go to Sheol" (Charles, "Eschatology," col. 1360).

We have also, besides Sheol, Gehenna or hell, as the final, not the immediate, abode of the wicked. The lines that divide this from the penal division of Sheol are, however, not firmly drawn; and, as time goes on, Sheol is more and more identified with hell.

There is considerable variety of opinion as to the nature of the resurrection. In some cases it is simply the spirits of the righteous dead that are raised

(Enoch ciii. 4). In other cases, however, the resurrection of the body is affirmed (II. Macc. vii. 11, xiv. 46). The difference between the two views is, however, modified by such statements as that the new body is a garment of light, and that those who possess it are angelic, or again, that the righteous are to rise vestured with the glory of God (compare Enoch li. 4, lxii. 1 f.), equal to the stars, and changed from beauty into loveliness, and from light into the splendour of glory (li. 10); they shall even surpass the angels (li. 12).

§ 3. ALEXANDRIAN JUDAISM

So far we have been tracing the views of Palestinian Judaism. In the Judaism of Alexandria, however, under Greek influence, further developments take place. The idea of the resurrection is exchanged for the Greek conception of the immortality of the spirit; and this exchange is accompanied by the adoption of the Greek dualism between matter and spirit, according to which matter is wholly evil, and therefore the body is to the soul a prison (Wisd. ix. 15).

The righteous spirit, then, enters on a blessed immortality immediately upon death (Wisd. iii. 1–4, iv. 7, 10).

There can be no resurrection of the body, since matter is incurably evil. Judgment, therefore, takes place at death, and all enter at death into their final abode. These points are developed by Philo, the Jewish Alexandrian philosopher (see Charles, col. 1367).

§ 4. CONDITIONS OF INDIVIDUAL SALVATION

Salvation is only for the righteous. Righteousness, however, is by all sections of Judaism identified with the observance of the law, the point of view of Deuteronomy being still further developed and enforced. By the Pharisees, the most typical Jews of the period, the idea of righteousness before God is carried out with a thorough-going legalism, which altogether transcends the legalism of the Old Testament; though in the later books traces of a tendency in the direction of Pharisaism may be found, as will presently be noted. In the Pharisaic view the law is divided up into single precepts; and God is represented as the great Heavenly Account-keeper, who writes down in His tablets the observances or non-observances of the precepts. (For an Old Testament anticipation of this point of view, compare Neh. xiii. 14.) The Pharisees further teach

that judgment follows according to the sum of the account. It was, in general, considered sufficient if the observances outweighed the non-observances. For the decision by which God admits the individual to salvation the term justification is used. We see that the idea is transferred from a connection with the nation, as in the Second Isaiah, to a connection with the *individual*, quite in accordance with the stress on the lot of the individual which characterises the later Judaism, as we have already seen. Judgment takes place, according to the Pharisees, at death; this judgment is, however, an anticipation of the final judgment.

§ 5. THE PHARISAIC IDEA OF MERIT AND ATONEMENT

The individual Israelite, however, according to the Pharisees, has sundry helps to justification in case his observances fall short. He himself may make atonement for his shortcomings by repentance, especially by the repentance of the great Day of Atonement, and also by good works such as almsgiving. (We have again here the development of ideas already found in the latter books of the Old Testament; compare Prov. x. 2,

xvi. 6; Dan. xiv. 27). The Pharisees teach that the sacrifices of the law also atone.

More prominent, however, than these methods of atonement, is the notion of the supererogatory merit of the saints of the Jewish Church, which can be supplied to make up the deficiencies of their compatriots (compare Paul's allusion in Rom. ix. 5: "whose are the fathers"). We even meet with the conception that all Jews must be saved in virtue of their descent from Abraham (compare Matt. iii. 9; John viii. 33 ff.).

Finally we find in the literature of the period the idea of the Goel, or redeemer, the martyr who by his sufferings makes propitiation for the sins of his nation (II. Macc. vii. 37, 38; IV. Macc. vi. 28, xvii. 20–28). In these passages the conception is not, as in Isa. liii., that vicarious suffering which benefits others along lines of ethical influence, but of a substitutionary atonement in the strict sense.

§ 6. THE IDEA OF SIN

We turn to notice the views of the apocalyptic and apocryphal writers and of the Rabbis on the subject of sin, especially as regards the consequences of Adam's

fall. In this period we for the first time clearly trace the influence of Gen. iii. on Jewish thought. Thus in Ecclus. xxv. 24 we have precisely the Biblical account of the Fall. In Wisd. ii. 23, 24, again, the influence of Gen. iii. is clearly seen. Its doctrine that (physical) death is the result of Adam's sin is also found in IV. Ezra iii. 7, and the Apocalypse of Baruch xvii. 3. In these passages, however, we have as yet no doctrine of original or hereditary sin. This, however, is found (perhaps under Christian influence) in IV. Ezra iii. 21 f., iv. 20, vii. 48. It is to be observed, however, that in these passages man appears not to be created perfect (nor, indeed, is he distinctly said to be in Gen. ii.), but has already in him a tendency to evil, which his fall makes the permanent principle of his action.

In spite of the Fall the responsibility of the individual is strongly asserted both in IV. Ezra viii. 59, ix. 4, and Baruch liv. 15–19, especially in the latter. The teaching of the Rabbis in the Talmud on sin is thus summarised by Weber (*Jüdische Theologie*, p. 216): "By the Fall man came under a curse, is guilty of death, and his right relation to God is rendered difficult. More than this cannot be said. Sin, to which the bent and leaning had been already planted

in man by creation, had become a fact; the evil impulse gained the mastery over mankind, who can only resist it with the greatest effort; before the Fall it had power over him, but no such ascendency." This doctrine of the evil impulse, it will be observed, agrees with that of IV. Ezra. The Rabbis also, like the Apocalypse of Baruch, strongly insist upon the reality of free will and on the direct responsibility of each individual.

We may complete this account of the doctrine of sin in the later Judaism by a reference to the teaching of Philo. He distinguishes in Gen. i. and Gen. ii. two originals of the human race, the first heavenly, the ideal man, made in the image of God; the second earthly, sensuous, and mortal. The distinction is, however, not strictly carried out; for to the lower man, who consists properly only of body and soul, and is thus mortal, the Spirit of God is given. This gift of the Spirit is sometimes equated, moreover, to the bestowal of the Divine image on the earthly man; so that the two conceptions are thus united. On his bodily side, however, the earthly man is material, and the Divine Spirit is enclosed in the body as in a prison. Adam's fall was his giving way to the power of the

senses. His posterity inherit both his fleshly nature and sinfulness, but also, at the same time, the traces of relationship to God (see Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, i. pp. 97–99).

§ 7. TRANSITION TO THE NEW TESTAMENT

In concluding this account of the long development of our doctrines up to the time of the New Testament, it is to be observed that the New Testament doctrines *presuppose the general results of it.* Jesus and the Apostles do not undertake to construct a complete system of doctrine altogether *de novo;* but build upon and assume, while amplifying and correcting, what has been already achieved. But they also have an eye, Jesus Himself in particular, to forgotten Old Testament points of view; while writers like Paul, the author of Hebrews, and John, have connections also with the Græco-Jewish thought.

CHAPTER III

THE TEACHING OF JESUS ACCORDING TO THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS

§ 1. THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD

In the teaching of Jesus the social and personal aspects of salvation are united in a deeper synthesis; while at the same time the future salvation of the prophets and of the later Judaism are combined with the present salvation of the early Hebrew religion by a spiritual view of things, which brings the present and the future together.

The development of the idea of salvation rests, just as the previous developments, upon a change in the conception of God. Just as, in the pre-exilic prophets on the one hand, the idea of salvation was the exact correlate of their conception of Yahweh, the absolutely righteous God of Israel; just as, in the later prophets and the apocalyptic writers, it was again the correlate of their conception of Yahweh as absolutely transcendent over the world; so in the teaching of Jesus the new idea

of salvation is the exact correlate of His new conception of God, viz. that of God as the Father.

This conception is not, indeed, an entirely new one. We find it in the Old Testament (Deut. xxxii. 6; Jer. iii. 4–19, xxxi. 8; Isa. lxiii. 16, lxiv. 7; Mal. i. 6; I. Chron. xxix. 10). Here, indeed, the reference is to the Israelites as a whole. But in the apocryphal and apocalyptic literature the notion is applied not only to the nation but to the individual (compare Ecclus. xxiii. 14; Wisd. ii. 16; Tobit xiii. 14; Jubilees i. 24). In the Rabbis from the end of the first century A.D. onwards we have also numerous instances of the idea.

With Jesus, however, the notion of Fatherhood dominates the whole conception of God. God is absolutely the Father—"the best father in the world," says Holtzmann (compare Matt. vii. 11).

The previous ideas of the prophets and of the later writers are not, indeed, lost. The righteousness of God is taken up into the notion of His Fatherhood; while His transcendence comes to view in the name of King, which Jesus, following Jewish usage, applies to God (Matt. v. 35). The absolute omnipotence of God is, indeed, fundamental to the conception of Jesus, just as to the previous Judaism (Matt. xi. 27).

But the fatherly character is central—God's omnipotence is at the disposal of His fatherly nature, and carries out its ends. The difference between Jesus and the Rabbis appears in that, even when they made use of the name of Father, they subordinated the idea of fatherhood to that of the transcendence of God. "In Jewish parlance it is unusual to refer to God in common discourse as Father without adding the epithet 'heavenly.' It is only in prayers that a different course is followed" (Dalman, "Words of Jesus," Eng. trans., p. 190). Jesus, on the contrary, uses the name of Father with an intimacy unknown to the Rabbis, and bids His disciples do the same. Compare especially the simple address "Father" in the original form of the Lord's prayer (Luke xi. 2); also "your Father" in Matt. vi. 8, x. 20, 29; "thy Father" in Matt. vi. 4, 6, 18. "The usage of family life is transferred to God" (Dalman, p. 192).

§ 2. THE KINGDOM OF GOD

Jesus uses, to describe the salvation which He offers, the traditional name of the "kingdom of God," thereby connecting His teaching with the long line of development of Jewish thought. The alternative expression,

"the kingdom of heaven," also found in the Synoptic Gospels, means just the same as the kingdom of God. Just as Heaven is a Jewish paraphrase for God, so the kingdom of Heaven is a Jewish paraphrase for the kingdom of God. The more indirect nomenclature is used for the sake of reverence.

By describing salvation as the kingdom of God, Jesus implies that the sovereignty of God is the chief good, and to be under His rule includes all blessings. But He further connects the promise of the kingdom with the Fatherhood of God (Luke xii. 32). Here is the point, whence a rich new development of the idea of salvation issues.

Jesus, indeed, makes use of the best in the existing views of salvation. Only the political and crassly material ideas are got rid of, along with the narrow particularism which characterised many Jewish presentations of salvation (Matt. viii. 11).

Salvation is in the first instance presented, in complete harmony with Jewish thought, as future. It is eternal life in the kingdom of God (Mark x. 30; Matt. xxv. 46); and the ordinary accompaniments of the Jewish idea of the kingdom are presupposed. Thus the judgment is mentioned (Matt. xi. 21, 24, xxv.

31–46); also the resurrection (Matt. xxii. 30–32). After the resurrection, further, the saved lead angelic lives (Matt. xxii. 30), a doctrine which we have already found in the apocalyptic literature. There are even passages where the ordinary language of the Jewish expectation is still more closely followed. Thus if, as is doubtless the case, the Beatitudes are primarily future, and refer to the kingdom that is to come when the world ends, this kingdom is spoken of as on the earth (Matt. v. 5). It is, again, spoken of as a feast, where the saved sit down (literally, recline as at a banquet) with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob (Matt. xi. 8; compare also Mark xiv. 25; Luke xxii. 30). No doubt these various expressions are figurative in the mouth of Jesus; but they show how closely His teaching connects itself with the previous Jewish hope of the future kingdom.

So far, then, the teaching of Jesus moves along traditional lines. The new idea of salvation, flowing from God's Fatherhood, comes to view, however, in a deeply spiritual conception of its nature, nowhere more clearly seen than in the Beatitudes (Matt. v. 3–12). As has been said, the salvation referred to in these is still in the first instance future. These wonderful sayings, however, prepare the way for the idea of present salvation, which

is the peculiar jewel of the teaching of Jesus. In so far as salvation is in essence spiritual, is comfort for mourners, righteousness for those who hunger and thirst after it, mercy for the merciful, the vision of God for the pure in heart, Divine sonship for the peacemakers; in so far salvation can be enjoyed in the present life, present evils being overcome not, as in the ancient idea, by God's turning of adversity into prosperity, but by those inner gifts which enable the soul to rise above adversity. The mourners can be comforted now; and so with all the rest of the spiritual blessings mentioned. Just because they are spiritual they transcend the division between here and there, now and then.

Thus we find Jesus distinctly speaking of the kingdom not only as future, but as present. It is already the Messianic age. The disciples have the bridegroom with them (Mark ii. 19). The miracles foretold in prophecy (Isa. xxxv. 5, 6) even now manifest the Messiah's presence (Matt. xi. 4, 5). What prophets and kings of old desired, the disciples enjoy (Matt. xiii. 17). Some are by anticipation already in the kingdom (Matt. xi. 11). Its coming is further seen in the defeat of Satan (Matt. xii. 28).

Again, in the parables of Mark iv. the mystery of the

kingdom (Mark iv. 11) would seem to be that the kingdom is already to be seen in germ in the small beginnings which Jesus has made (compare the parable of the mustard-seed, Mark iv. 30–32). In spite of all failures the word of the Gospel is bringing fruit to harvest (compare the parable of the sower, Mark iv. 1–9). Mysterious in its working is the Gospel word, which produces such results (compare the parable of the seed growing secretly, Mark iv. 26–29). These parables, then, as well as the passages previously quoted, furnish evidence that Jesus thought of the kingdom not only as future but as present. And finally, Luke xvii. 20, 21, whether the correct rendering of the Greek be "the kingdom is within you" or "the kingdom is among you," seems equally to bear witness to the idea of a kingdom of God realised in the present.

§ 3. SONSHIP

The most characteristic name, however, which Jesus uses to describe the present salvation is one which, in contradistinction to the name "kingdom," brings out the individual character of this salvation, though not to the neglect of its social aspect. This name is "sonship." Sonship is a blessing of the future kingdom (Matt. v. 9),

but can be enjoyed here (Matt. v. 44, 45). It is realised in the knowledge of and trust in God's Fatherhood, by means of which the cares and anxieties of earthly life are removed and the soul finds perfect peace (Matt. vi. 25–34).

It should be noticed that, while the idea of sonship has immediate reference to individual salvation, yet indirectly it suggests the social aspect of salvation, which is more directly denoted by the name "kingdom of God." Sonship is the correlate of the Fatherhood of God, which equally embraces all His sons. All sons of God, however, are brothers one of another (Matt. xxiii. 9). The idea of sonship, therefore, can never exist without the thought of the great family of God, in which the sons share the blessing of the Divine Fatherhood in community. God is not only "thy Father" (Matt. vi. 4), He is also "your Father" (Matt. v. 45).

§ 4. CONDITIONS OF SALVATION: FAITH AND REPENTANCE

The conditions of salvation, according to the teaching of Jesus, are often said to be faith and repentance (compare Mark i. 11, "Repent and believe the good

news"). The statement is, however, not strictly accurate. Faith is not with Jesus a condition of salvation, but rather the subjective realisation of salvation, whether of future salvation as hope, or of present salvation as experience. Trust in God's Fatherhood is, in fact, simply the subjective realisation of sonship. To believe the good news of the kingdom is essentially the same thing as to trust in the goodwill of the Father, who will in His own good time give the kingdom (as future) to those who wait for it (Luke xii. 32). And, as has already been seen, present salvation and trust in the goodness of the Father are one and the same thing. We cannot, therefore, properly speak of faith as a *condition* of salvation; it is better to say that in faith salvation is subjectively appropriated and realised.

Repentance is more strictly a condition of salvation. It is necessary, however, at the outset to observe that "repentance" in the mouth of Jesus must not be taken in the narrow sense in which the word is commonly used in English. The word which in our English version is translated repentance means properly "change of mind"; and if we retain the word repentance in our account of the teaching of Jesus, it must be understood to be used in this larger sense. The change of mind

implied is in its negative aspect a turning away from sin: it has a positive aspect, however, also, which is a turning to God. The completest illustration of the whole idea is in the parable of the prodigal son (Luke xv. 11–32).

§ 5. RIGHTEOUSNESS

We begin first with the positive aspect, leaving over the negative aspect, till we consider the relation of salvation and sin in the teaching of Jesus. The positive aspect of repentance is the moral condition which Jesus attaches to entrance into salvation. To understand its meaning properly, we must now turn to bring out specially the moral element involved in the conception of salvation formed by Jesus. Here the ideas of the pre-exilic prophets come to their full value. Just as to them the kingdom was essentially the sphere of righteousness under the rule of the righteous God, so also with Jesus. Righteousness is a chief blessing of the kingdom (Matt. v. 6). Those who are in the kingdom are those whom God approves as righteous. Compare Matt. iii. 20, where, however, Jesus gives the idea of righteousness itself a new development, by means of a contrast between the true righteousness of

the members of the kingdom and the Pharisaic idea of righteousness. The contrast is carried out in detail in Matt. v. 21–vi. 18. Righteousness, according to Jesus, is not the mere external keeping of the commandments of the law, but is a matter of the heart and the motive. Not the letter only of the law of Moses must be carried out, but also its inner spirit; and, if need be, the letter must give way, that the spirit may be more fully realised. Above all, the measure of the true righteousness of the members of the kingdom is to be found in the character of God Himself (Matt. v. 48). In this way the new conception of God as Father comes in to complete the idea of righteousness with the factor of disinterested love, and Jesus finally brings the moral character of salvation to view by means of the description of salvation alternative with the kingdom, which is the correlative of God's Fatherhood, viz. sonship (Matt. v. 44, 45). Sonship includes the imitation of God, our Father. It is not only a privilege, but a responsibility. And since God is love, love is the law of sonship (Luke vi. 36). The climax of the better righteousness of the members of the kingdom is found, therefore, in the law of universal love, which we call the golden rule (Matt. vii. 12).

The active exercise of righteousness is, then, with Jesus the condition of entrance into the kingdom; and, since all moral action is a progress towards an ideal (Matt. v. 48), or a seeking (Matt. vi. 32), or even a strife (Luke xiii. 24), it involves sacrifice and self-denial, upon the necessity of which, accordingly, great stress is laid by Jesus. Compare especially Mark ix. 43–47 for the sacrifices Jesus requires, and Mark viii. 34 for the central place given to self-denial. Along with the glad evangel of God's Fatherhood which Jesus preaches, there is to be found in His moral teaching a stern asceticism, in the true and highest sense of the word, which is the necessary complement of the joyous message, and of which even such a requirement as that made of the young ruler (Mark x. 21) is only a specialisation. Whatever hinders the true righteousness of the kingdom must be cut off at any price.

We turn to another aspect of the subject. Righteousness was just now spoken of as the condition of entrance into the kingdom of God. From what has been said earlier, however, it will be evident in what sense righteousness is a condition of entrance into the kingdom. It is a condition because the kingdom itself is one of righteousness; because righteousness is a chief blessing of the kingdom (see Matt. v. 6, vi. 33). But

it is not the condition in the sense that the kingdom is earned by righteousness, as was taught by the legalism of the Jewish theology. On the contrary, the kingdom itself remains always the gift of God (Luke vi. 32). This is one of the paradoxes of Jesus, which, however, is perfectly intelligible to Christian experience. Jesus, indeed, frequently in the language of Jewish theology speaks of the reward which God gives for our conduct (Matt. v. 12, vi. 1, 4, 6, 18); at the same time He makes it quite clear that the idea of reward is not to be taken strictly by the remarkable parable of the labourers in the vineyard, a parable which is absolutely opposed to the legal idea of reward according to the amount of work. The master gives to the servants not according to their legal claims, but according to his own good pleasure. None, indeed, receive less than they deserve; but the labourers hired later in the day receive much more than they are legally entitled to receive (Matt. xx. 1–15).

§ 6. SIN

We turn now to the negative side of the idea of repentance. The change of mind it implies is to righteousness, but from sin. By the general call to

repentance (Mark i. 15) Jesus presupposes that all who hear Him are sinners. So, also, He speaks of men in general as sinners (Luke xiii. 2, xv. 7, 10, xviii. 13). He comes to sinners, as the physician comes to the sick (compare Mark ii. 17). The existence of any who are actually righteous is not implied by the above text; it remains hypothetical. Even the disciples are "evil" (Matt. vii. 11; Luke xi. 13).

At the same time Jesus recognises relative differences in men. There are good and bad men just as there are good and bad trees (Matt. vii. 43–45). Jesus, again, speaks of some as possessing an honest and good heart (Luke viii. 15).

The attitude of Jesus toward sin is, in fact, practical rather than theoretical. There is little doctrine of sin in His teaching. The following points, however, come to view. Sin is an offence against God (compare Luke xv. 21, where Heaven is, according to Jewish usage, a paraphrase for God). Jesus speaks of sins as debts, and sinners as debtors towards God (Matt. vi. 12). Or, again, He calls sins "trespasses" (Matt. vi. 14). These figures give us a general conception of what Jesus understood by sin: it is a transgression of God's will, which entails guilt before God.

There is, however, in the teaching of Jesus no doctrine of original sin. In Mark vii. 23, indeed, we read that "evil things proceed from within, and defile the man." The point here, however, is simply (in opposition to the idea of defilement from without) that the things which defile proceed from within. But there is nothing to imply whether they proceed from the free resolve of the will, or only from this as determined by a sinful nature. In general Jesus thinks only of actual sins or of sinful habits. He does not go behind these to a philosophy of their cause. If He gives such explanation at all, it is implied in what He says of the weakness of the flesh (Mark xiv. 38).

Jesus expresses His sense of the terrible state of the sinner by describing him as "lost" (Matt. xviii. 11–14, Luke xv. 3–32); that is, according to these parables, separated from God, as the strayed sheep from the shepherd, the coin from its owner, the prodigal son from his father. But this state of separation from God involves terrible penalties both in this world and the next. As regards the punishment of sin, Jesus in the main simply accepts the doctrines of the prophets and of the later Judaism. Like the prophets, He sees the hand of God punishing sin in the cala-

mities of history. He views the destruction of Jerusalem and the end of the Jewish state as the direct punishment of the sins of the Jews (Matt. xxi. 40–44, xxii. 7, xxiii. 32–36, Luke xix. 41–44). He repudiates, however, the inference that special calamities always mean special sin (Luke xiii. 1–5). As regards the penalties of sin after death, Jesus follows the Jewish theology in describing the state of sinners, whether before or after the judgment, as one of fiery torment (Matt. v. 22, Mark ix. 43–48, Luke xvi. 23–31, Matt. xxv. 46). That the fiery torment, however, is figurative appears from the use of a different figure (Matt. viii. 11, 12, xxii. 13), in which the punishment of sin after death is imaged as darkness and cold outside the banqueting hall, which represents the kingdom of God. The idea that runs through all the teaching of Jesus as to the state of the lost after death is that it is exclusion from the kingdom of God, and therewith the utmost misery (Matt. vii. 23, viii. 12, xxvi. 41). The worst earthly punishments are as nothing to the punishment of sin after death (Mark ix. 42–48). Jesus however, recognises degrees of punishment, varying with the degrees of guilt (compare Luke xii. 47, 48). This text, however, shows that some guilt

attaches even to those who knew not the Lord's will: their ignorance was culpable ignorance. So when (Matt. xi. 20–24) Jesus says that it shall be more tolerable in the day of judgment for Tyre and Sidon and Sodom than for the cities that had not repented at the sight of His mighty works, it is not implied that Tyre and Sidon and Sodom go unpunished: on the contrary, these cities, which were notable examples of God's judgments (*cf.* Jude 7), are simply used to measure the extreme gravity of the punishment of the cities, which were even greater sinners than they.

§ 7. SALVATION AND SIN

After this discussion of the teaching of Jesus with respect to sin, we have now to return to repentance in its negative aspect, as a turning from sin. On this side the idea of Jesus is really represented by our English word repentance. The abandonment of sin and the confession of sin are both implied (Luke xv. 18). There is also implied the prayer for God's mercy (Luke xviii. 13).

God answers this prayer by a full and free forgiveness, and thus opens the way to the kingdom. Forgiveness is, however, not only bestowed when the sinner first

turns to God in repentance; but, since even those sin, who are in the kingdom, and enjoy present salvation, forgiveness is one of the continual blessings of the kingdom in the present life, a thing for which the disciples are to pray, as they pray for their daily bread (Matt. vi. 11, 12). Thus Jesus finds a place in His conception of salvation for the Divine forgiveness associated with the kingdom by the prophets. But whereas they connect forgiveness with the future salvation (Jer. xxxi. 4; Zech. xiii. 1; even Isa. xl. 2, xliii. 25 are anticipatory of the future salvation), Jesus connects forgiveness with the present salvation, and so gives to their great idea of forgiveness as a chief blessing of salvation, a new scope and value. He also reveals its eternal ground in the Fatherhood of God. The Father, who in His love gives to His children the kingdom (Luke xii. 32), gives to them as lost children, as sinners, as a chief blessing of the kingdom, the free forgiveness of their sins. See Matt. vi. 9–15, where forgiveness is grounded in the Fatherhood of God. Above all compare the parable of the prodigal son (Luke xv. 11–24).

We must note, however, that while Jesus depicts the forgiveness of sins as one of the chief blessings of the kingdom, He knows of a sin which cannot be forgiven,

either in this world or the next (Mark iii. 28, 29). This is the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which from the context seems to mean the woeful sin of putting evil for good and good for evil, as the Pharisees did, when they ascribed the miracles of Jesus to Beelzebub (Mark iii. 22–30). Whereas words directed personally against Jesus as a man could be forgiven, such blasphemy of the Divine power, that was manifested in the works of Jesus, could not be forgiven (Matt. xii. 32).

It is finally to be observed that though, when it is said that forgiveness follows upon repentance, it is the negative aspect of repentance which is immediately contemplated; at the same time the positive aspect of repentance is implied as well. There is no real repentance without this, no turning from sin without turning to righteousness. In this way repentance in its positive aspect, or active righteousness, appears as a condition of the forgiveness of sins, a truth which Jesus teaches in one way when He says that without true righteousness it is not possible to enter the kingdom, which, as the sum of all blessings, includes for sinners the forgiveness of their sins. He teaches it also in another way by emphasising as a condition of the Divine forgiveness that particular form of righteousness, which consists in the

imitation of God's forgiveness in our relations one to another. This necessary connection between forgiving and being forgiven Jesus expresses both in pregnant aphorisms and in vivid parables (compare Matt. vi. 14, 15, xviii. 23, 35).

§ 8. THE UNIVERSALISM OF JESUS

In all the teaching of Jesus as to salvation and sin there is an implicit universalism. Jesus, indeed, preached actually only to Jews, and in one place at least consciously limits His earthly mission to his own people (Matt. xv. 24). At the same time Jesus addressed His fellow-countrymen rather as men than as the children of Abraham. There is very little of His teaching, for instance, in the Sermon on the Mount, which is not immediately applicable to men universally. In process of time, in fact, Jesus actually asserted that salvation was equally for the Gentiles and for the Jews (see Luke xiii. 29). In regard to this saying, Luke's chronology seems preferable to that of the Gospel of Matthew, where it appears much earlier in the ministry of Jesus (Matt. viii. 11). Luke enables us to regard it as belonging to a later period of the ministry of Jesus than

Matt. xv. 24, just now quoted; and hence helps us to arrive at a more intelligible conception of the development of an explicit universalism in the teaching of Jesus. The historical cause of this development would seem to be the growing alienation of the Jews from Jesus on the one hand, and on the other the repeated experiences of Gentile faith contrasting so markedly with Jewish unbelief. See Matt. viii. 5–13, the account of the healing of the centurion's servant, omitting only viii. 11, 12, as above explained: Luke's version does, in fact, omit these words from this context (Luke vii. 2–10). See, again, Matt. xv. 21–28, the account of the healing of the Syrophenician's daughter. In such cases as these Jesus had remarkable instances of Gentile faith, the contrast of which with Jewish unbelief provoked His wonder (Matt. viii. 20, xv. 28). It is, therefore, intelligible enough how, when the Jewish leaders manifested a final rejection of the message of Jesus, He proclaimed the passing over of the kingdom of God from the Jews to the Gentiles (Matt. xxi. 43). Thus was made explicit the universalism implicitly contained in the Sermon on the Mount. It was made clear that salvation was for all who would receive it, whether Jews or Gentiles, the conditions being not racial, but simply moral.

§ 9. ANTHROPOLOGY OF JESUS

In view of this universalism of Jesus, we may stop for a moment to consider what He teaches of man. His doctrine is all practically implied in His teaching upon sin and salvation. Man appears as a possible son of God. In a sense, indeed, he is a son already, though a lost one; but to become a son in the full sense (Matt. v. 45; the literal translation of the Greek is "that ye may *become* sons of your Father which is in heaven"), he must enter on and realise his sonship, *i.e.* be saved (compare Luke xv. 4–24).

As regards the constitution of human nature, Jesus simply adopts the common Jewish dualism of body or flesh, and soul or spirit, which He makes use of in ways that are no different from those already noted, either in the Old Testament or in later Jewish writers. Thus in Mark xiv. 38, Jesus suggests, quite in Old Testament fashion, the weakness of the flesh as the ground of sin. Again in Matt. x. 28, the soul appears as the immortal part, which survives after death (compare also Luke xii. 20). This opposition of soul and body, taken along with the doctrine that the souls of the wicked go to hell, is what we have found in the later

Judaism. The idea of the destruction of the body as well as the soul in hell, seems to presuppose a resurrection not only of the just, but of the wicked for judgment, before the wicked find their ultimate location.

On the other hand, the words of Jesus in Mark xii. 25 seem to connect themselves more naturally with the other view, found also in the later Judaism, viz. that only the just rise again.

§ 10. THE MESSIAH

No account of the teaching of Jesus on sin and salvation can be complete without a reference to His teaching concerning Himself in relation to these points. In His doctrine of the kingdom of God, the Messiah is essential; though this fundamental necessity of the Messiah to the kingdom is often rather implied than explicitly affirmed. Jesus claims Himself to be the Messiah, and His fundamental position as guaranteeing the kingdom often is implied simply in the authoritative way in which He speaks, resting the message of the kingdom on His own sole word. Compare the reiterated "Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, but I say unto you," of the Sermon on the Mount.

Besides such indirect assertions of His essentiality to the kingdom, there are not wanting, however, the most direct assertions of the same. We shall have to keep both forms of assertion in view in our discussion.

First of all, then, with regard to present salvation, if, as we have seen, this consists in the knowledge of God's Fatherhood, Jesus claims alone to be able to reveal God to men, and thus to bring men into the state of salvation (Matt. xi. 27). The claim thus made is involved in the whole work and teaching of Jesus, and is at the same time in another way unfolded by this. The character of the work and teaching of Jesus gives substance to His claim. It is on His authority, the authority of His word and works, and the impression of His person, that man can believe in God's Fatherhood. In His attitude to men, the attitude of the Father is made plain, and claims men's trust and obedience. Thus Jesus says on the one hand (Matt. xix. 14), "It is not the will of your Father, which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish"; on the other hand He says (Luke xix. 10), "The Son of man is come to seek and save that which was lost," and in His whole bearing towards sinful men manifests the love, which He declares to be characteristic of God.

Compare Luke xv. 1, and observe that, by the parables which follow, Jesus justifies His attitude to the Pharisees by identifying it with the attitude of God towards sinners (Luke xv. 3–24).

In view of this moral oneness of Jesus with the Father, it is intelligible enough that the reception of the kingdom, which is fundamentally a reception of the Fatherhood of God, is also a reception of Jesus Himself. Entrance into salvation takes place through a coming to Jesus Himself (Matt. xi. 28), and an acceptance of Him as Teacher and Lord (Matt. x. 24, xxiii. 8). If Jesus describes the salvation of the kingdom as the chief good beyond all others, the hid treasure (Matt. xiii. 44), the pearl of great price (Matt. xiii. 45, 46); if, again, He points to trust in the Fatherhood of God as the source of perfect peace, and of freedom from all anxiety (Matt. vi. 25–34), He equally associates the finding of rest with His own person, with coming to Him, learning from Him, and taking His yoke (Matt. xi. 28–30). Finally, Jesus not only calls men into the kingdom, but also personally exercises that chief blessing of the kingdom, which the Father bestows on sinners, viz. the Divine forgiveness (Mark ii. 5). Jesus, the Father, and the

kingdom are then indissolubly connected. He is the plenipotentiary of God on earth, who is entrusted with all its affairs (Matt. xi. 27). Or in the language of Jewish prophecy, He is the Messiah, the human king of the Divine kingdom (Mark xvi. 13–17). Jesus accepts the term from the history of His people; and uses it, as He does the idea of the kingdom, stripping off the political associations of its historical origin, and giving a new and deeper meaning of His own to the time-honoured name. See Mark x. 42–45, a passage to be discussed more fully later on.

The connection between Jesus, the Father, and the kingdom comes out further in regard to future salvation. In His later teaching, Jesus presents this as bound up with His own Parusia or manifestation in Divine glory (Matt. xvi. 27, 28). This form of teaching accompanies the prophecy of His death which is also characteristic of the later teaching of Jesus. Jesus is to die at the hands of men; but He will come again in glory, "the glory of His Father with His angels" (Matt. xvi. 27), and His coming will be the coming of the kingdom (Matt. xvi. 28). Jesus will then come to gather together His elect (Matt. xxiv. 31), and at the same time to inaugurate the last Judgment.

(Matt. xvi. 27). Jesus sometimes represents Himself as Judge in the last Judgment, as in the text last referred to, and also in the great parable of the last Judgment (Matt. xxv. 31–46). In other cases, however, Jesus represents God as the Judge and Himself as the assessor of His Father's judgment (Matt. x. 32, 33). The moral unity of Jesus and the Father, before referred to, makes it plain that these two representations are interchangeable. Moreover, in both forms of representation it is made clear that the final destiny of men is fixed by their relation to Jesus. In the parable of the last Judgment, where Jesus Himself is the Judge, it is those who have honoured Jesus in the hungry, the thirsty, the stranger, the naked, the sick, or the prisoner, who find entrance to the kingdom: those who have not thus honoured Him, on the other hand, go away into eternal punishment. In the statement of Matt. x. 32, 33, where Jesus appears as assessor, the final destiny of men turns on their confession of Jesus; He confesses before God those who have confessed Him and denies those who have denied Him. In either case, then, the same lesson is taught. As in relation to present salvation, so again in regard of future salvation, it is made plain that Jesus and the

kingdom are indissolubly connected. There is no entrance to the kingdom apart from Jesus.

§ 11. THE SIGNIFICANCE OF THE DEATH OF JESUS

Yet another connection between Jesus and salvation appears in His teaching concerning His death. When towards the close of His ministry Jesus was faced by His impending death, He taught that this, too, would serve the Divine purpose of salvation (Mark x. 45). He Himself, as the head of the kingdom, falls under the law of the kingdom, which, unlike the kingdoms of the world (Mark x. 42), is that the higher the rank in the kingdom, the greater is the service required (Mark x. 43, 44)—such is the new form in which Jesus now expresses the previously mentioned law of love. Jesus accordingly views His whole life as one of service, the climax of which is His death. "The Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give His life a ransom for many." In this context, then, the death of Jesus appears as His supreme act of service. At the same time a specific benefit is attached to it, viz. the redemption of many. This is the particular service which it renders.

A number of questions arise in connection with the pregnant phrase in which Jesus describes the fruit of His death: "A ransom for many." Who are the many? From what are they redeemed? In what does their redemption consist? How is the death of Jesus a ransom?

The second question is perhaps the easiest to answer. The state of mankind, subject to sin, and expectant of the Divine judgment after death, is naturally likened to bondage. Sin and hell hold men captive. They are subject to the one, and doomed to the other.

Next the answer to the third question is clear. The redemption of the captives consists in their deliverance from sin and hell, that they may become participators in the kingdom of God.

The question, Who are the many? is not so easy to answer. It may be all those who from first to last enter the kingdom of God, or it may be those who after the death of Jesus shall be brought into the kingdom, His death achieving for them what His life has done for the disciples. The latter explanation is that of Wendt ("Teaching of Jesus," Eng. trans., ii. pp. 226–234). It seems to rise naturally out of the historical situation, and seems also to agree with John xii. 24–32, if we

may at this point bring in the Gospel of John to interpret the pregnant brevity of the Synoptic record. These Johannine passages, in the context in which they are set, viz. in connection with the desire of the Greeks to see Jesus, seem to teach that Jesus will win by His death the fruit denied to Him in His life, viz. the conversion of the Gentiles.

We return, however, to the other explanation, viz. that the many are all those who from first to last enter the kingdom of God. This is the interpretation of Ritschl (*Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*,[3] ii. pp. 80–83). In favour of this is to be alleged the general doctrine of the New Testament, if we prefer to explain the isolated saying of Jesus (Mark x. 45) by the general tenor of the views of the early Christian Church. There is no doubt, that even if historically the first reference of Mark x. 45 and John xii. 24–32 may be to those brought into the kingdom after the death of Jesus, in the early Christian Church such sayings would have been interpreted with the wider reference at least to all who enter the kingdom; and it is a question whether, even if Wendt is right as to the historical application of the sayings, beneath this first reference the principle asserted by Ritschl is not contained. There

cannot well be two ways of redemption into the kingdom of God, one for the first disciples and another for those converted after the death of Jesus. Nor is it thinkable that Jesus Himself could have entertained such a distinction, even though historically the first reference of His words may have been as Wendt says.

The final question, then, is, How is the death of Jesus a ransom? The literal translation of the Greek of Mark x. 45 is "to give His life a ransom *instead* of many." Are we to take the phrase, "a ransom instead of" as simply occasioned by the figure of deliverance from captivity? And is the meaning, then, that the death of Jesus delivers men from sin as a ransom delivers men from bondage, the parallel, however, being only in the idea of deliverance, and the way in which the death of Jesus delivers men having to be inferred not from the figure of ransom, but from general considerations?

Or are we to look for light on the way in which the death of Jesus delivers men, from the actual turn of the phrase, "a ransom instead of many"? Then there is no doubt that the explanation lying nearest to hand is that suggested by the passages previously referred to in the books of Maccabees (see above, p. 38). As the

Jewish martyr prayed that his death might atone for the sins of his compatriots, so Jesus regards His death, according to this explanation, as an atonement for the sin of all the members of the kingdom of God; for this is the interpretation which in this case we shall have to put upon the "many." The Jewish martyr offers his death that all Israel may be saved, and Jesus that the spiritual Israel may be saved.

This last interpretation, which seems to the writer most probable, may perhaps seem to the reader unduly to limit the range of Christ's atonement, and to conflict with other passages in the New Testament, such as I. John i. 2, where Jesus is said to be the propitiation for the sins, not of believers only, but of the whole world. Of course the first answer to this objection is that we are here concerned with historical theology, and our prime business is not to reconcile one passage in the New Testament with another, but simply to state what we find in each case; nor, again, to make our result square with our convictions of what ought to be, but rather to record exactly what we find. But there is a further answer. In reality this view of the atonement, so far from limiting the application of the benefit of the death of Christ, points to a deeper conception of the

idea of atonement. Since Jesus offers His death, not for a definite number like Eleazar, but for the indefinite "many," who become members of the kingdom of God, it is clear that the merely external idea of substitutionary sacrifice, such as we find in Maccabees, is transcended. If Christ's atonement avails only for those who are brought into the kingdom (and, as we have seen, the entrance into the kingdom can take place only through their subjugation to His person), then it is evident that there must be some deep-lying connection between the atonement and the personal influence of the Saviour. We have, in fact, to postulate in Mark x. 45 such an ethical interpretation of the idea of substitutionary sacrifice as is given in Isa. lii. 13–liii. 12—a passage which, it is important to observe, actually influenced the mind of Jesus, when contemplating His death (Luke xxii. 37; compare Isa. liii. 12).

The result to which we have been led simply by consideration of Mark x. 45 is confirmed by the other passage in which Jesus speaks of the benefit of His death (Mark xiv. 22–25). Here He views His death as a covenant sacrifice, establishing a new covenant between God and man. In a symbolical action this sacrifice is set forth under the figures of broken bread

and outpoured wine, which represent the body and blood of the slain Victim. Jesus then calls His disciples to participate of the bread and the wine, that is to say, of the sacrifice. The idea of sacrificial communion, previously explained, is thus used to illustrate the way in which the disciples share the benefits of the death of Jesus. As before Jesus spoke of His life as given for many, so now He speaks of His blood as shed for many (Matt. xxvi. 28 adds, "for the remission of sins"). We note in passing that as here there is no question but that the disciples who are in symbol invited to participate of the sacrifice are included in the "many," a light is reflected back upon the "many" of Mark x. 45, who, from the parallelism of the passages, are presumably the same "many;" and thus from a new point of view we get fresh confirmation of the correctness of Ritschl's interpretation of Mark x. 45, as over against Wendt's.

To return to Mark xiv. 22–25. Many ideas combine in this perhaps richest of all presentations of the efficacy of the death of Jesus. There is an allusion to the founding of the old covenant, as recorded in Exod. xxiv. 1–11, which covenant was also established by a sacrifice, by which Israel was brought into communion

with God. Still more is there a reference to Jeremiah's prophecy of the kingdom of God under the figure of a new covenant, the special features of which are the law implanted in the heart, and the forgiveness of sins (Jer. xxxi. 31–34). The thought, then, is that the salvation which Jeremiah prophesied as future is now realised as present, being mediated by the sacrifice of Christ, which establishes the kingdom of God, as the sacrifice of Moses established God's first covenant with Israel.

If we may regard as a piece of the original tradition of the words of Jesus, the addition in Matt. xxvi. 28 of the words "for the remission of sins," the sacrifice of Jesus is further thought of as expiatory, just as in Mark x. 45. This is not contrary to the fact that it is a covenant sacrifice, or that its virtue in bringing men into connection with God is connected with participation. In ancient ideas of sacrifice, one interpretation was not necessarily exclusive of another. It is true that in the priestly code the sacrifices of atonement were distinguished from those of communion in that the former were not participated of by the worshippers, while the latter were so. But this differentiation is of late origin, and does not represent the only way of regarding

sacrifice. With the rule of the priestly code may be compared what Robertson Smith says of sacrifice in early Israel ("Religion of the Semites,"[2] p. 237): "The old history knows nothing of the levitical sin-offering; the atoning function of sacrifice is not confined to a particular class of oblation, but belongs to all sacrifices." That is, in ancient Israel, not sacrifices wholly made over to God only, but sacrifices of communion, were regarded as atoning. There is no contradiction, therefore, in the combination of the ideas of atonement and communion in Mark xiv. 22–25.

The new idea, however, of communion or participation, which this passage contains over above the idea of atonement, which it has in common with Mark x. 45, is of the utmost importance in determining how we are to interpret the idea of atonement in the teaching of Jesus. It points again to the fact that the external idea of substitution requires to be transcended, before we arrive at Christ's own view of His death as an atonement. It brings out even more clearly than before the point that subjective conditions required to be fulfilled before the death of Jesus is efficacious as an atonement.

CHAPTER IV

THE SPEECHES OF PETER IN THE ACTS

It is the future salvation which fills the mind of the early Church, as represented to us by the speeches of Peter in Acts. The message of the Apostles to their countrymen is first that Jesus is the Messiah (ii. 36); as has been conclusively declared by His resurrection, of which they are witnesses (ii. 32). His death, sinful as had been the action of the Jewish rulers in bringing it about, was in accordance with the Divine purposes (ii. 23), and had been foretold in Old Testament scripture (iii. 14). That it had taken place was therefore only an additional proof that Jesus was the Messiah.

The apostolic message is next that, though Jesus has been thus shown by His resurrection to be the Messiah, the Messianic salvation still remains to be realised (iii. 19–22). Jesus was not at once restored to His nation by the resurrection: he only showed Himself to His chosen witnesses among the Apostles, that they might proclaim His Messiahship. In the words of Beyschlag ("New Testament Theology," Eng. trans., i. p. 315):

"God had taken Him back into His heaven, as if to wait to see whether the people would repent of their outrage, and make themselves again worthy of their Messiah. This view, which though strange to us was quite familiar in the thoughts of the original Apostles, is especially prominent in the passage, Acts iii. 19–21."

The present, therefore, is a time of repentance, during which God gives to Israel opportunity to return to Him, and the Apostles consequently renew the call to repentance of Jesus Himself, promising to those who repent and are baptized the advent of the great Messianic salvation. But the repentance required is no longer the general repentance taught by Jesus. It is the specific wickedness of the Jewish nation, misguided by their rulers, in crucifying Jesus, that requires to be repented of; and the positive side of this repentance is faith in Jesus as the Messiah. He is proclaimed as the only Saviour (iv. 12) in the approaching day when those who reject Him will be cut off.

All this has reference to the future salvation. In the present, however, the forgiveness of sins may be enjoyed (iii. 19); and in the present, too, as harbinger of the great coming salvation, the Spirit has been poured out upon the company of believers (ii. 15–18); so that this gift, too, may be received by the repentant (ii. 38).

CHAPTER V

THE THEOLOGY OF PAUL

§ 1. THE DOCTRINE OF GOD

We begin, as in our study of the teaching of Jesus, with the doctrine of God; since this is what determines the idea of salvation. Paul's doctrine of God is not completely unified. As a general background we have the idea of the one God (I. Cor. viii. 4–6), who is the source and goal of the universe (Rom. xi. 36; I. Cor. xv. 28). Next we have conceptions which come straight from the Old Testament, without Christian transformation or even modification, *e.g.* the notion of the wrath of God, as in Rom. i. 18, iii. 5, v. 9. Paul never inquires how this Old Testament conception is to be harmonised in one personal unity of character with the Fatherhood which Jesus teaches. A mediation, however, is seen in the idea of God's righteousness, which with Paul by no means always means simply justice, as in Rom. iii. 5, but in its most characteristic Pauline use includes saving grace (Rom. iii. 21, 22, 27). Here Paul follows the Old Testa-

ment conception of God's righteousness, especially as found in the second Isaiah and the Psalms (see the discussion of the idea above, in connection with Isa. xl.–lv.).

Finally we have the specifically Christian conception of God, the idea of His free grace and love. Just as with Jesus, so with Paul, God is Father (Rom. i. 8, viii. 15; Gal. i. 3, iv. 6; I. Cor. i. 3; Phil. i. 2; Col. i. 12; Eph. i. 2), and that of every family, both in heaven and earth (Eph. iii. 14, 15). The "abba" of Jesus, says Holtzmann (*Neutestamentliche Theologie*, ii. p. 96), is verbally retained, as though the natural speech of the Christian soul.

Above all, God is the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ (Rom. xv. 16; II. Cor. i. 6; Col. i. 3), whom He loves as His other self (Rom. viii. 32: "His *own* Son"). In Him God's love is completely revealed. This is the central point, not only of Paul's theology, but also of his religion. The grace of the one is the grace of the other (Rom. v. 15). The love of God is in Christ Jesus our Lord (Rom. viii. 35, 39). The love of Christ, who gave Himself for us (Gal. ii. 20, Eph. v. 2, 25), is the revelation of the love of God, who gave Him to die for us (Rom. v. 8).

Hence, in Paul's doctrine of salvation, it is made plain throughout that salvation is at once the work of God

and the work of Christ. This idea, essential to the teaching of Jesus, is by Paul placed in the centre of his whole view. At the same time the name of Jesus for salvation, viz. the kingdom of God, in the theology of Paul retires into the background, and is, at least in connection with present salvation, replaced by others, the most characteristic of which is the phrase "in Christ." Salvation is in general to be "in Christ." All this will become clear, as we study Paul's conception of salvation both as present and future. It is especially clear in the idea of present salvation, in which Paul's originality specially appears.

§ 2. FUTURE SALVATION

We begin, however, with the Pauline conception of future salvation; for, just as in the case of Jesus, present salvation is regarded by Paul as an anticipation of future salvation, and the peculiar character of the Pauline descriptions only becomes clear when the subject is discussed in this order.

The name, kingdom of God, which, as was observed just now, has almost disappeared from Paul's vocabulary as a description of present salvation, is still used by him to describe future salvation. This he connects, like the

early Church in general, in the closest way with the Parusia of Christ. His thought on the whole subject, however, undergoes considerable changes in the different stages of his teaching. Charles ("Eschatology" in "Encyclopædia Biblica," col. 1381) distinguishes four stages, attested by (1) I. and II. Thessalonians, (2) I. Corinthians, (3) II. Corinthians and Romans, (4) Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians.

In I. and II. Thessalonians the Parusia appears not only as the day of salvation for the people of Christ, but also as the day of judgment and punishment of the wicked. "This judgment deals with Antichrist and all the wicked, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether simply careless or actively hostile. The doom of the wicked is 'eternal destruction' (II. Thess. i. 9; compare I. Thess. v. 3; II. Thess. ii. 10)" ("Eschatology," col. 1382). The resurrection is of those who have died before the advent of Christ; while those who survive to see Christ are caught up with them "to meet the Lord in the air" (I. Thess. iv. 17). "There is no reference to a resurrection of the wicked in the two epistles" (Charles, col. 1382). The world appears to be given up to destruction, while Christ's people are raised even as He (I Thess. iv. 14); that is, not to an earthly life, but to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ in the kingdom of

God (II. Thess. ii. 14; cp. I. Thess. ii. 12; II. Thess. i. 5). There they are ever with the Lord (I. Thess. iv. 17).

The description of future salvation in I. Corinthians is not very different. The Parusia again appears as the day of judgment (I. Cor. i. 6, v. 5, viii. 13). The resurrection is again for those who belong to Christ. As God has raised up Christ, so will He also raise us (I. Cor. vi. 14). It is then in Christ that men are made alive (I. Cor. xv. 22). The resurrection body is spiritual (I. Cor. xv. 44). "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (I. Cor. xv. 50). The righteous dead are raised, and the righteous living are transfigured, in order to share in the kingdom (I. Cor. xv. 51, 52). With this, death is finally overcome (I. Cor. xv. 26). A remarkable feature in the eschatology of I. Corinthians is this: Paul regards the kingdom of Christ as finally lost in the kingdom of God. The Messiah re-delivers His authority to God, its source (I. Cor. xv. 24). We may compare with this doctrine the idea of a temporary kingdom of the Messiah, which we previously found in some of the Jewish Apocalypses: the great New Testament parallel is, of course, the idea of the Millennium in the Apocalypse of John, which was previously mentioned as being in the line of the aforesaid Jewish Apocalypses. To

return to Paul, he depicts as the final bliss of the kingdom, that the righteous, in immediate communion, see God face to face (I. Cor. xiii. 12).

In II. Corinthians and Romans great changes are observable in the view of future salvation. The crisis of Paul's thought on the subject, in fact, lies between I. Corinthians and II. Corinthians, and it is natural to connect the change in his view with the experience mentioned in II. Cor. i. 8, 9, in which Paul had been brought face to face with death, and thus driven to consider more closely than ever before the power of God in the resurrection. Paul, in his desire to be immediately with God after death, seems to have put to himself the question: Why should the righteous "sleep" until the Parusia, and only then be raised? (Compare I. Cor. xv. 51, 52.) Why should not the resurrection power of God manifest itself immediately at death, so that communion with God may begin at once? Paul, we observe, unlike the Alexandrian Judaism, has no idea of the communion of the unbodied spirit with God.

Not everything is changed in the new view. We have the Parusia as before, and with it the Day of Judgment (II. Cor. i. 14). Christ Himself is the Judge (II. Cor. v. 10), or otherwise God (Rom. xiv. 10). [We

observe the same variation here as in the representations of Jesus.] All men must appear before the judgment-seat (Rom. xiv. 10), and judgment is according to works (Rom. ii. 6; II. Cor. v. 10, xi. 15).

But Paul no longer defers the possession of the resurrection body for the righteous until the Parusia. "The main evidence for this," says Dr. Charles (col. 1385), "is found in II. Cor. v. 1–8 (where a specially careful translation is required; see, *e.g.*, Weizsäcker's)." It seems best, therefore, to give Weizsäcker's translation of II. Cor. v. 1–8 in full. Rendered into English from the stereotype edition of his *Das Neue Testament übersetzt*, it is as follows:—

"But we know that when our earthly tent-dwelling is dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal in heaven. Therefore we sigh, desiring to be over-clothed with our habitation from heaven; we shall not, however, be found naked, when we put it on. We sigh, namely, while we are in the tent; it presses upon us, so that we shall not be first unclothed, but rather over-clothed, in order that the mortal may be swallowed up of life. For thereto hath God prepared us, He indeed, who has given us the earnest of the Spirit. We are of good cheer, therefore, in the consciousness of the home with the Lord,

which we lack, so long as we have our home in the body—for we walk by faith, and not by sight—we are yet of good cheer, and our thought is bent to this, to change the home in the body for the home in the Lord; therefore we set everything on this, to please Him, away from home as at home: we must, however, all be manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ, that each one may obtain his portion from the life in the body, to which his deeds tended, be it good or bad."

Upon this passage, Dr. Charles further observes as follows (*loc. cit.*): "In ver. 4, Paul declares his wish to live till the Parusia, in order that he may escape the destruction of the earthly body, and be transformed alive. In other verses he faces the possibility of death, and comforts himself and his readers with the prospect before them. *When* we die, we have—we come into possession of—an immortal body in heaven."

Hence the Parusia is no longer the time of the resurrection of the righteous dead to glory, but of the manifestation of the glory they already possess (Rom. viii. 19: so, later, Col. iii. 4).

In Philippians, Colossians, and Ephesians, the fresh development is that the idea of the final resignation of the kingdom of Christ to the Father is abandoned

in favour of the view that the kingdom of Christ is everlasting. The final kingdom is the kingdom of God and Christ (Eph. v. 5). This view is accompanied by the further doctrine that the mediation of salvation through Christ extends not only to men, but to angels. All things in heaven and earth, visible and invisible (whether thrones or dominions or principalities or powers), are intended to find their consummation in Christ as their head (Col. i. 16; Eph. i. 10). Those spiritual beings, therefore, which have sinned or apostatised must ultimately be reconciled to God through Him (Col. i. 20), and join in His worship (Phil. ii. 10).

Here we reach the final phase of Paul's thought on future salvation. It may be added that Paul has not in any stage completely systematised his views on this subject. Dr. Charles, however, summarises the ultimate tendency of Paul's thought as follows: "Since all things must be reconciled and summed up in Christ, there can be no room finally in the universe for a wicked being, whether human or angelic. Thus the Pauline eschatology points obviously in its ultimate issues either to the final redemption of all created beings or the destruction of the finally impenitent" ("Eschatology," col. 1386). It is noteworthy

that throughout Paul's epistles there is no mention of a general resurrection of the righteous and the wicked alike. It will appear, when we have discussed Paul's ideas of present salvation, that according to his views there could not be a resurrection of the wicked. It is necessary, therefore, to point out that in Acts xxiv. 15, where a belief in a general resurrection is attributed to Paul, we cannot have an accurate report of his doctrine (see further Charles, col. 1382, note 3).

§ 3. PRESENT SALVATION

The teaching of Paul on present salvation falls into three stages, the first and last of which correspond to the first and last stages of his teaching on future salvation; while the single middle stage here corresponds to the two middle stages of teaching there. The only difference is that in the new grouping Philippians falls, by its theological affinities, together with the middle group of epistles rather than with the epistles contemporary with it. We thus obtain the groups: (1) I. and II. Thessalonians; (2) Galatians, I. and II. Corinthians, Romans, Philippians; (3) Ephesians and Colossians.

I. and II. Thessalonians

The teaching of these "primer epistles," as Bruce calls them, need not long detain us. There is in them little doctrine of present salvation. The state of Christians is rather that of those who wait for Christ's second coming (I. Thess. i. 10); so that their faith, or belief in Christ's Messiahship, appears as the basis of their hope (I. Thess. i. 3, v. 8, 9). Meanwhile, however, they enjoy the gift of the Spirit (I. Thess. iv. 8), and their faith finds practical expression in patience under persecution (I. Thess. iii. 2, 3, 7, 8, v. 8). So far is Paul from his later antithesis of faith and works, that in I. Thess. i. 3 he speaks of the work of faith.

Galatians, I. and II. Corinthians, Romans, Philippians

In these epistles we find the most characteristic form of Pauline doctrine, which must now be considered at some length. Peculiar to it above all is the fact that what Jesus includes under the single head of the kingdom of God, is here by Paul split up into two hemispheres, which in general he keeps apart, though

attempts to establish a connection between them are not altogether wanting.

For these two halves of salvation Paul uses a very varied vocabulary. The first is described as justification, or adoption, or sometimes reconciliation; the second appears either as mystical union with Christ, or as the gift of the Spirit. The word redemption is used for both alternately.

Common to both hemispheres is an ultimate reference to the idea of future salvation. It is in each case the anticipation of the final salvation in one of its aspects, that Paul has in view. This comes out especially clearly, when the two aspects of present salvation are defined as justification and the gift of the Spirit.

§ 4. JUSTIFICATION

To begin with justification: we saw that in the Pharisaic theology justification signifies the verdict of God's final judgment upon a man, accepting him as righteous in His sight, and which gives him a claim to enter into the future kingdom of God. Justification is thus with the Pharisees an immediately eschatological conception; though the final decision of God may indeed be conceived as anticipated at the man's death.

Paul takes the conception from the Pharisaic theology, in which he had been educated; but makes the great change that he relates the idea of justification to *present* salvation. With Paul justification means the right to the enjoyment of salvation here and now (Rom. v. 1, 2). To be justified by faith (ver. 1) is equivalent to having had access into God's grace, so as now to have a standing in it (ver. 2). Compare also ver. 8, "being *now* justified by His blood." Also see I. Cor. vi. 11: "ye were justified." These references clearly exhibit the significance of justification as an aspect of present salvation. The eschatological reference of the conception is, however, never wholly lost. It is always implied that the right to salvation here and now, and the right to final salvation, are one. It is, however, the notion of present justification which is characteristic of Paul. In opposition to the Pharisaic idea of justification by works, previously explained—*i.e.* the conception that a man's right to salvation depends on his observance of the law, and cannot, therefore, be settled till his life account is closed—Paul uses the idea of justification to express the present right of the Christian to salvation, which God Himself bestows. The particular aspect of salvation, which Paul has here in mind, is the right to communion with God, the right to call Him Father, and find rest

in the thought of His providential care. Adoption, therefore (Gal. iv. 5; Rom. viii. 15), is another name for this aspect of salvation, which brings out clearly the fact that the position of sonship is the free gift of God.

Again, in connection with this new idea the eschatological reference is as clear as in the case of justification. The right to present and future salvation are thought under it as one. The right of sonship includes within itself all rights, whether to present or future salvation. Hence Paul says (Rom. viii. 17): "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Christ." And in Rom. viii. 23, Paul actually uses the name adoption to signify not the present but the future salvation, a fact which strikingly illustrates the eschatological connection of the conception. To sum up, justification or adoption is, in this characteristic view of Paul, God's final decision as to the position of the believer, already *anticipated* in the present life; though as yet full entrance into all that the believer thus has a right to has not yet been given.

Meanwhile, however, he enjoys the sure hope of glory, a hope which even tribulations only serve to confirm, since the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit (Rom. v. 1–6). Observe

here the opposition not only to the Pharisaic point of view, but to that of the Old Testament, according to which calamities led men to doubt God's favour, and salvation was seen just in the removal of calamities. Nowhere is this more apparent than in the way in which Paul in Rom. viii. 36 quotes from Ps. xliv. 22 the words: "For Thy sake we are killed all the day long, we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter." In the mouth of the Old Testament writer these calamities appear as a proof that God has forsaken His people (Ps. xliv. 9). What Paul has to say of them is: "Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors through Him that loved us" (Rom. viii. 37). We have here an exact repetition of the ideas developed by Jesus under the wider point of view of sonship (Matt. v. 4, vi. 25–34; Luke xii. 32).

Paul grounds the comfortable assurance of present salvation on the grace of God or His free love (Rom. iii. 24), which, indeed, is the source of all salvation, whether present or future. The whole process of salvation, in fact, appears to Paul as one (Rom. viii. 30); so that he says, "whom He justified He also glorified." Paul in all this simply reproduces, in his own way, Luke xii. 32.

§ 5. THE GIFT OF THE SPIRIT

The other half of present salvation in the view we are now considering is the gift of the Spirit. Perhaps the connection of this with future salvation is most clearly expressed in a phrase not in our group of epistles, but in Eph. i. 14, where Paul speaks of the Spirit as the "earnest of our inheritance." The phrase, however, exactly sums up the view of the gift of the Spirit, which is found in the epistles we are dealing with. Its signification is that the future salvation is *of the same nature* as the salvation contained in the gift of the Spirit. The difference between them is not qualitative, but quantitative only. The gift of the Spirit here is thus the partial anticipation of future salvation; as Paul says in Rom. viii. 23, "we have the first-fruits of the Spirit." This becomes clearer still when we see that Paul regards the Spirit as the principle and power of immortal life, bestowed on men even while in the body. Here a light is cast back upon certain facts in the middle stages of the Pauline eschatology, which we are now in a position to appreciate. We see how it was that Paul moved from his early idea that the resurrection body is bestowed on the righteous at the Parusia, and came instead to the view that it be-

comes their possession at death. They have, in fact, by the gift of the Spirit the principle of eternal life within them already in the present life; and this principle only awaits the death of the mortal body to embody itself in a new and spiritual habitation. This notion is already in principle contained in Paul's teaching about the nature of the resurrection body, when he compares the resurrection with the germination of a seed (I. Cor. xv. 36–38). Still more clearly does the same conception appear in the great passage, II. Cor. v. 1–8, already quoted at length in Weizsäcker's very accurate translation, to which reference is here again made (compare also Rom. viii. 11).

Paul's conception of the gift of the Spirit as the principle of eternal life already immanent in the Christian explains, then, the reason why he came to view the Christian's entrance into future glory as taking place at death: it explains also the Pauline doctrine that the resurrection is only for those who die in Christ. Since the resurrection body follows from the immortal new life possessed by the Christian, as the corn results from the seed, it is clear that there can be no resurrection for the wicked, seeing that they do not possess this immanent life.

We obtain still further light on the nature of the gift

of the Spirit, and as to how it is connected with future salvation, when we turn to Paul's alternative statement for the same thing. The Spirit which God bestows in salvation is none other than the Spirit of the Risen Christ (Rom. viii. 2, 9); the immortal life which He gives is the immortal life of the Risen Saviour. Here the way is opened for Paul's great thought that salvation is union with Christ in His resurrection life. (Compare II. Cor. iii. 18, where the life of the Christian is represented even here and now as involving a progressive communication of the immortal life of the Risen Lord.)

Hence is explained the way in which, in the final stage of his eschatology, Paul comes to speak of the future salvation. He speaks of it as simply the outward revelation of the inner life, which the people of Christ possess in union with Him. Their life is now hid with Christ in God, but will then be manifested for all to see (Col. iii. 3, 4).

§ 6. THE CHANGED RELATIONS OF FUTURE AND PRESENT SALVATION

In the foregoing account of the Pauline ideas of present salvation we started out to show the connection

of these ideas with future salvation, *i.e.* that in each case Paul had in view the anticipation of future salvation in some aspect. But now that this has been shown, something else has been shown also. We see a reaction taking place, in which, instead of present salvation being regarded as an *anticipation* of future, future salvation tends to be regarded as the *completion* of present salvation. In the later forms of Pauline doctrine, this point of view becomes more and more dominant. We owe to Paul, in fact, the formal inception of the mode of thought which is more familiar to us, in which the centre of gravity is shifted from the idea of future to that of present salvation. In the teaching of Jesus this readjustment is materially, but not formally, present. The great new and original elements in His teaching lie in the description of present salvation; but the conclusion is never formally drawn that future salvation is simply the completion of present salvation. In the early Church of Acts we observe a reaction towards the Judaistic mode of thought, in which future salvation is altogether dominant. Paul, starting indeed, in Thessalonians, on the ground of the early Church, in his developed teaching not only returns to the material position of Jesus, but finally draws the formal conclusions involved in it.

§ 7. SALVATION AND SIN

Paul's further descriptions of his two hemispheres of present salvation, *e.g.* reconciliation, baptism into Christ's death, bring out the particular reference of salvation to sin. In the Pauline theology this reference is much more worked out than in the teaching of Jesus, and indeed even the positive or prospective aspects of salvation, such as justification or the right to life, and the gift of the Spirit, or the earnest of immortality, are also defined by Paul retrospectively, and brought into close relation with the doctrine of sin. It is, in fact, the antithesis of sin and salvation which, in its various forms, gives its peculiar stamp to Paul's thought. When Jesus in His most characteristic teaching, as, *e.g.*, in the Sermon on the Mount, develops the positive side of salvation for the most part absolutely, and, as it were, entirely from within, Paul in his specially characteristic teaching, as, *e.g.*, in the Epistle to the Romans, balances all that he says of salvation with antithetic teaching on sin, and, what is more, does this in such a way that the doctrine of sin comes first and the doctrine of salvation follows. Once more we recognise in Paul the precursor of the usual method of Christian theology, whether Catholic or Protestant.

We turn, then, before pursuing the Pauline idea of salvation any further, to the doctrine of sin, which is its great complement, in which also Paul's doctrine of man is involved. We enter upon a highly characteristic and important phase of Pauline thought. Paul is the great hamartiologist of the New Testament, and has developed the doctrine of sin to a degree elsewhere unknown in it.

§ 8. MAN AND SIN

By sin Paul understands, like all other Biblical writers, that which is contrary to the will of God. He sets himself to prove that sin is *universal*. This he does in various ways. The first proof is from the facts of experience, by means of an actual survey of mankind in his own age (Rom. i. 18–ii. 28). Jews and Gentiles alike are thus shown to be in a state of sin (Rom. iii. 9). The second proof is from the universality of death. Since Adam death is everywhere in the world (Rom. v. 14); but death, as Paul affirms, is the wages of sin (Rom. vi. 23). Hence the universality of death proves the universality of sin. Compare Rom. v. 12: "death passed unto all men, for that all sinned."

Paul, however, goes further than the empirical universality of sin. Man being what he is, sin is *inevitable*.

Paul gives different reasons for this. The first reason he gives is that the fall of Adam brought sin into the world. The passage in which this is explained (Rom. v. 12–21), is very difficult in its exegesis. What is central, however, for Paul in the fall of Adam, and claims our attention at the present moment, is that Adam's fall opened the way for the dominion of sin over mankind (compare Rom. v. 12: "through one man sin entered into the world"). Paul conceives sin as a power, almost personal. Sin reigns (Rom. v. 21); compare the phrases "sin revived" (Rom. vii. 9), "sin slew me" (Rom. vii. 11). We may compare the tremendous personification of sin by Milton in "Paradise Lost."

The second reason which Paul gives for the inevitableness of sin is quite different from the first. It is not historical, but philosophical. Paul regards sin as inherent in the flesh. Man is carnal, sold under sin (Rom. vii. 14). In him, that is in his flesh, dwells no good thing (Rom. vii. 18). "This theory," say Wernle, "is neither Jewish nor Greek, but an original creation of Paul" (*Die Anfänge unserer Religions*,[1] p. 139). There is a starting-point for it in the Old Testament view, which we have seen to be adopted by Jesus, that the flesh of man is weak, frail, and perishable, and that man, therefore, in so far as he is flesh, is liable to sin.

Nearer still to the Pauline doctrine comes the later Jewish doctrine of the evil impulse, as found in IV. Ezra and the Talmud. But Paul goes beyond the Old Testament view in that he thinks of the flesh as not merely weak but positively evil (compare Gal. v. 17; Rom. viii. 7). Paul similarly goes beyond the later Jewish view, in that he carries his assertion of the inherent sinfulness of the flesh so far as to deny the free will of man, who is in complete bondage to sin in the flesh (Rom. vii. 14; see further Rom. vi. 15–23). In these points Paul seems to approach nearer to the Greek view, as illustrated in the Book of Wisdom and in Philo, according to which the flesh as matter is absolutely evil. And in fact we find Paul speaking of the body as a burden (II. Cor. v. 4); just as Wisdom ix. 15 says "a corruptible body weigheth down the soul," and as Philo regards the body as the prison of the soul. "But Paul, in spite of all this, is not a Greek" (Wernle, *op. cit.*, p. 140). He never says that the flesh as matter is intrinsically evil; on the contrary, the body can be sanctified and made the temple of the Holy Ghost (I. Cor. vi. 19), and its members instruments of righteousness (Rom. vi. 13; compare further Rom. xii. 1). In these passages, indeed, Paul uses the word "body," not the word "flesh"; but they conclusively prove that he

did not regard the flesh as matter as intrinsically evil; for if he had done so, the body made of it must have been incapable of sanctification. In one passage, if it is genuine, viz., II. Cor. vi. 14–vii. 1, Paul even speaks of the sanctification of *flesh* and spirit (see vii. 1). This passage is, however, considered by some scholars not to be Pauline. In any case, however, from the evidence previously cited it is clear that Paul does not agree with the Greeks, any more than he does with the Jews. We have the important result that Paul does not teach the sinfulness of the flesh *as matter*, and so leaves the way open for some other reason of its sinfulness.

Yet Paul does come very near to the Greek view after all. While he thus speaks of the sanctification of the body, and possibly, in II. Cor. vii. 1, of the sanctification of the flesh, his general position is rather that the flesh is to be mortified or crucified as the enemy of the soul.

We have further to recognise that while the flesh as matter, or the body, can be sanctified, the flesh as the seat of sin apparently remains irredeemable (compare Gal. v. 17, Rom. vii. 18, viii. 7). The flesh, therefore, with Paul, comes ultimately to mean simply the sum of the evil tendencies in human nature. In Paul's doctrine of the flesh there comes to view the

great experimental fact of the dominance of a tendency to evil, explain it how we will, in human nature—a fact which the great philosopher Kant recognised as fundamental, and made the basis of his whole philosophy of religion. No doubt the way in which the bodily impulses are the occasion of sin may have led Paul to give to this sinful principle in human nature the name of the "flesh," a word which, as we have seen, at any rate in a sense approximating to the Pauline, lay ready to his hand in the Old Testament. Paul's whole meaning, however, cannot be obtained simply from considerations as to the genesis of his terminology. In the end it is Paul's own experience that speaks in his doctrine, as Wernle well points out, and a new idea comes to view that carries us beyond the natural meaning of the word used.

We have, then, in Paul two theories of the origin of sin: the historical theory, which derives it from the fall of Adam, and the philosophical, or perhaps we may now call it the experimental theory, which derives it from the inherent sinfulness of the flesh. Is there any connection between the two theories? As is well known, they have been combined in the common ecclesiastical doctrine, that with the fall of Adam the nature of man was corrupted, and thus the "flesh" in

the Pauline sense originated: this sinful nature passing from Adam to his descendants by natural descent. Paul, however, does not affirm so much. He merely says that through the fall of Adam sin entered into the world as a power (Rom. v. 12). The ordinary doctrine, of course, gives a satisfactory explanation of this statement. There is, however, the alternative explanation possible, which is suggested by a comparison of the doctrine of IV. Ezra, according to which the evil impulse existed already in Adam before the Fall, but obtained supremacy by means of it. In this case the "flesh" would not originate through the Fall; though actual sin would do so. It has been argued by some scholars (*e.g.* Sabatier) that this is shown to be Paul's real view by the fact that in Rom. vii. 11 he distinctly suggests a parallel between the origin of sin in the descendants of Adam, and in Adam himself. The parallel appears in that the original process by which sin took advantage of a positive command of God to deceive man, and thus bring death upon him, is repeated in each individual case. As the Apocalypse of Baruch liv. 19 says: "Each one of us has been the Adam of his own soul."

Holtzmann in his *Neutestamentliche Theologie* (ii.

pp. 41–46) leaves the question, as to which of the two rival interpretations of Paul is right, an open one, and it is perhaps best here to follow a scholar of such great experience, particularly as either explanation raises as many difficulties as it solves.

§ 9. THE LAW

The Pauline doctrine of sin is bound up with a doctrine of the law, which is specially characteristic of the teaching of the Apostle, and owes its origin to the particular circumstances of his conversion and his mission. As a Pharisee, Paul had himself sought salvation by the law, before he found it in Christ; hence his own experience naturally leads to the comparison of the two methods of salvation, the Pharisaic and the Christian. Since what, as a Pharisee, he had especially been led to seek by the law was justification, or the right to salvation, it is in regard to this aspect of the subject that Paul compares the two methods. This he does in the sharp antithesis: "By the works of the law shall no man be justified; in Christ alone man is justified" (compare Rom. iii. 20–24; Gal. ii. 16). This antithesis in some of Paul's greatest epistles like Galatians and Romans dominates the whole argument.

In framing it he was not merely expressing his own experience, but was also meeting an urgent necessity of his apostolic mission. As the Apostle of the Gentiles Paul had to deal with the opposition of Jews and Jewish Christians, who still in one way or another looked for salvation by the law, and who denied the standpoint which was essential to Christianity as he understood it, viz. that salvation depended on Christ and on nothing else whatever.

Paul means by the law in the first place the law of Moses. This, as a Pharisee, he had taken to be the perfect expression of God's will; and still, as a Christian, he speaks of it to the same effect. "It is holy, just and good" (Rom. vii. 12). There is, moreover, in man an element which corresponds to the law, acknowledges its authority, and desires to obey it. This element Paul calls the "mind," as in Rom. vii. 25; or else he names it the "inner man," as in Rom. vii. 22. In I. Cor. ii. 11 the name "spirit" also seems to be used as an alternative for the mind; but this is unusual in Paul. Recognition of the law of Moses can of course take place only where it is known. Paul, however, finds an analogue of it in "the law written in the heart," which is observable even in Gentiles, who have no knowledge of the law of Moses (Rom. ii. 15; heart in this passage

seems to be another synonym for mind or inward man). In connection with this doctrine of the law of nature Paul develops a doctrine of conscience, which is interesting as completing his idea of the inner man or mind. Upon the observance or non-observance of the "law in the heart" follows the verdict of conscience, either approving or disapproving (Rom. ii. 15). Paul's "conscience" is not a legislative, but simply a judicial faculty. He seems to have learned the name, and probably the doctrine also, from the Stoics, perhaps at Tarsus, which was the seat of a university.

This higher nature, or "mind," then exists in man along with the lower nature, or flesh. When the law appeals to it, the mind recognises its authority, and desires to follow its direction. But it is thwarted by the flesh, and in the conflict which ensues the flesh proves itself the stronger. The "law in the members" overrides the law of the mind (Rom. vii. 23). The law, holy, just, and good as it is, is therefore unable to save man, in that he is weak through the flesh, or, as Paul puts it with pregnant brevity, in that the law itself is weak through the flesh (Rom. viii. 3). So far from saving, the law brings nothing but condemnation, and anticipates in man's conscience the final judgment of God (compare Rom. iii. 19; see also

Rom. ii. 15). By the law, in fact, all men are shut up under sin, and so under wrath; "the law worketh wrath" (Rom. iv. 15). Paul indeed admits the law, if observed would save (Gal. iii. 12). But the admission is really only dialectical. It is understood throughout that no one can observe the law (compare Gal. iii. 4).

Paul makes a distinction in some places between sin and transgression. If sin is opposition to the will of God, transgression is conscious opposition to it. Where there is no law, there can be no transgression. Thus between Adam and Moses sin was in the world; but it did not amount to transgression. Hence it was not imputed, or reckoned in the heavenly books (compare Rom. v. 13, 14). During this period, indeed, the presence of sin in the world was proved by the presence of death, its necessary accompaniment; at the same time, as there was no law in the world, this sin was not of the nature of transgression like the sin of Adam, which was a direct act of disobedience to a positive commandment. And so finally in this period there was no imputation of sin, or in modern phraseology, no guilt.

Paul does not reconcile this point of view with what he elsewhere says about the law written in the heart,

which exists even where there is no positive commandment. We should conclude, on the basis of Rom. ii. 14, 15, that those between Adam and Moses were at least under this form of law. Further, where Paul says "the wages of sin is death" (vi. 23), the idea of sin here includes ill desert or guilt. Death is here viewed not as the natural consequence of sin merely, but as its just reward; so that the idea of guilt must be implied. Paul is therefore not completely consistent with himself on the subject now before us. The important distinction, however, which he draws in Rom. v. 14, 15 suggests the principle that guilt varies with the amount of knowledge, a principle which we have already found enforced in the teaching of Jesus in Luke xii. 47, 48.

§ 10. THE PUNISHMENT OF SIN

We return to the passage, "The wages of sin is death." Death is then the punishment of sin; but what exactly does Paul mean by death? In the first place he means physical death, as is shown by Rom. v. 12–14, especially in the words, "through one man sin entered into the world, and death through sin." Death, like sin, is here a power in the present world: thus it is physical death which first and foremost appears as the punish-

ment of sin. But Christians also are subject to physical death. Are they, then, subject to the punishment of sin? Paul obviates this conclusion by regarding physical death for the Christian as simply the prelude to his resurrection. It is, according to Paul's earlier view, a sleep till the day of resurrection (I. Thess. iv. 15), or, according to his later view, the immediate gate of access into the presence of Christ (Phil. i. 2). Thus it becomes clear that by death as the punishment of sin, Paul means not only physical death, but the destruction which follows it (II. Thess. i. 9). It is not clear whether Paul thought of this destruction always as instantaneous, as II. Thess. i. 9, or as lengthened out while the wicked endure the penalties of their particular sins, as other passages would seem to suggest (Rom. ii. 8, 9; II. Cor. v. 10). Perhaps Paul did not think out his views on this subject to completion. But that final annihilation is the doom of the wicked, unless somehow they are redeemed even after the death of the body, we saw previously to be involved in the Pauline view of the resurrection as resulting from the immanent Divine life of the Christian.

In any case Paul connects the punishment of sin with the already mentioned character of *wrath* in God. God's wrath even now impends over sinful men (Rom. i. 18);

but crushes them finally at the last Judgment, which is therefore spoken of as "the wrath" (Rom. v. 9, xii. 19).

§ 11. SOTERIOLOGICAL PURPOSE OF THE LAW

The question of the law is not wholly exhausted, however, in this terrible concatenation with sin, death, and wrath. The law has, in fact, in the providence of God an indirect relation to salvation. This appears in different ways.

1. Condemnation is the necessary precursor of justification through Christ. Here Paul has in view the self-reliance of the Pharisee, who counts himself able to earn salvation for himself by merit. This self-reliance must be broken down before a man will seek justification through Christ (compare Rom. x. 3). The law, however, itself is adapted to break down the self-reliance of the man who seeks salvation by means of it, if only he takes the matter seriously enough. It effects the destruction of self-reliance in such a case through its claim to absolute fulfilment, which is seen to be impossible, as soon as conscience is sufficiently awake in a man for him to realise the full amount of his shortcoming (compare Gal. ii. 16, iii. 20; Rom. vii. 24).

2. Paul, moreover, assigned to the law a soteriological

purpose in that in the actual state of man it serves to increase sin (Rom. v. 20). He made the subtle psychological observation that the knowledge of the commandment serves only to provoke the flesh to enmity against it. As soon as the commandment is known, the flesh immediately desires what is prohibited (Rom. vii. 7, 8). This stirring up and increasing of sin, however, has for its end the bringing of the spiritual disease of man to a head, in order that he may more fully realise his need of healing (Rom. v. 20, 21, vii. 24, 25).

3. Paul therefore opens out finally a view in which the stage of law appears merely as a transitory stage in the whole Divine purpose of salvation. Here he has mainly in view the historical sequence of God's purpose with Israel. Salvation was promised to Israel in Abraham long before the law was given by Moses (Gal. iii. 15 ff.). "The law came in beside," says Paul, "that the trespass might abound" (Rom. v. 20), *i.e.* that sin might be brought to a head in the way just now explained. From this view of the transitory significance of the law follows the further view of it, in which Paul attributes to it a less than Divine origin. The law, he says, "was ordained through angels by the hand of a mediator" (Gal. iii. 19). Paul does not reconcile this view, however, with the other we have previously discussed, in

which the law appears as the direct expression of the Divine will and nature, holy, just and good. But it is evident that we have in Gal. iii. 19 an important suggestion as to how the Jewish element in Paulinism must be ultimately related to the Christian, and as to how the legal may be distinguished from the moral view of the law. And although Paul, in his actual writings, deals in the first place only with the relation of the Jewish law to Christianity, it is evident that what he says applies to all legalism as contrasted with the Christian view of things.

§ 12. THE DOCTRINE OF PRESENT SALVATION VIEWED IN REFERENCE TO SIN: THE JUSTIFICATION OF THE SINNER

We now return, after our discussion of the doctrines of sin and the law, to take up once more the Pauline doctrines of salvation, and to develop them more fully. In their complete form they have continual reference to the doctrines of sin and the law. In fact it is the nature of the peculiar Pauline view that it is very difficult to separate accurately between the prospective and retrospective aspects of salvation. What could be done, therefore, before the doctrines of sin and the law had been discussed, was hardly more than to mark out the two hemispheres of the Pauline doctrine of present salva-

tion, and show their eschatological connections. The fundamental doctrine of the mediation of salvation through Christ has, however, been left to be discussed in the present connection.

We saw that the Pauline view of justification was fundamentally opposed to that of the Pharisees. Where they sought to establish a salvation by merit (Rom. x. 3), Paul teaches that the right to salvation is the free gift of God, or is accorded by His grace. Grace and works are mutually exclusive (Rom. iii. 27, iv. 4).

Grace, however, in Paul's thought is not merely opposed to works and merit: it is also opposed to sin. The transition follows immediately from the idea of the search for salvation by the performance of the law to the idea of man's inability to perform the law because of his sinfulness, and his corresponding condemnation by the law. In opposition to this condemnation by the law stands justification by grace. Here the Pauline idea of justification reaches its most remarkable phase, finding expression in the paradox of Rom. iv. 5, which speaks of God as "Him that justifieth the ungodly." The paradox is designed, as a reference to the Old Testament shows, where the justification of the wicked is strongly reprobated (compare Exod. xxiii. 7; Deut. xxv. 1; Prov. xvii. 15; Isa. v. 23). Paul's paradox points

to the fact that in grace the law is transcended and done away. The state of justification is, in fact, one of freedom from the law (Rom. vi. 14).

This Pauline paradox has always been an offence to some ever since his own time (Rom. iii. 8, vi. 1). It seems as though it made God act unethically in passing a sentence, which is not according to the facts. This sentence, however, is only unethical if forgiveness is unethical; for justification, in its retrospective aspect, is only the Pauline way of expressing the forgiveness of sins (compare Rom. iv. 7, where Paul quotes from Ps. xxxii. 1 the verse, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man to whom God will not reckon sin"). The whole point of the quotation lies in the identification of the forgiveness of sins spoken of by the psalmist with justification (compare Rom. iv. 5, 6).

Still fuller light upon the Pauline idea of justification, however, is given by the consideration of a fresh alternative idea, viz. that of reconciliation (in II. Cor. v. 19 reconciliation = the non-imputation of sins, *i.e.* justification). This new idea subsumes under another figure both the positive and negative aspects of justification. The Pauline conception of reconciliation,

while negatively equivalent to the forgiveness of sins, or the laying aside of God's wrath against the sinner, is also positively the bringing of the sinner into communion with God by removal of the sinner's enmity towards Him (compare II. Cor. v. 19: "God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself").

We thus see that the Pauline justification is no mere formal sentence of acquittal, pronounced upon a person who is left unchanged in spirit. Rather does God, in justifying the sinner, also reconcile him to Himself; or, to make use of the alternative phraseology of adoption, God, in according to the sinner the right of sonship (Gal. iv. 2; Rom. viii. 17), also imparts the spirit of sonship (Gal. iv. 6; Rom. viii. 14, 15).

All these things Paul sums up by saying that justification is not only of grace, but also by faith, in which statement his doctrine of justification finally receives its characteristic expression and completion. Faith in Paul's sense is, above all, trust—trust in God's grace; and in this trust the blessedness of present salvation in communion with God is progressively realised (compare Rom. v. 1–11, viii. 31–39). Here it is to be observed that faith is not a work of man, which can be set in opposition to the works of the law. It is not so much, as it is after called, the condition of salvation,

as the subjective realisation of salvation. The proper alternative to justification by works is justification by grace (Rom. iii. 24). Justification by faith (Rom. v. 1) is simply a pregnant expression describing the mode of justification by grace.

§ 13. JESUS CHRIST: HIS DEATH AND RESURRECTION

How does the Divine grace justify man by faith? The Pauline answer is, By the redemption that is in Christ Jesus (Rom. iii. 24). There Paul repeats a fundamental principle of the teaching of Jesus, namely, that salvation is mediated personally through Him; but he makes the principle more explicit, and moves it right into the centre of the whole view. That the love of God is revealed in Jesus Christ, is the absolute foundation principle of Pauline theology. As we have seen, the grace of the one is the grace of the other (Rom. v. 15). The love of God is in Christ Jesus our Lord (Rom. viii. 35–39). So faith in God and faith in Christ are one and the same (Rom. iii. 22, iv. 24). Justification and reconciliation, therefore, take place through Christ.

In particular, Paul connects justification and recon-

ciliation with the death and resurrection of Christ, especially with the former. We are justified by Christ's blood (Rom. v. 8), reconciled through His death (Rom. v. 10). Paul, in fact, represents the death of Christ as an expiatory sacrifice (Rom. iii. 25), ordained by God to show at once His judgment upon sin, and His grace towards sinners (II. Cor. v. 21; Rom. iii. 25). On the one hand the righteousness which would otherwise have been shown in the punishment of sin is demonstrated in the Cross (Rom. iii. 25). This takes place in that Christ bears the curse of the law for us, viz. death (Gal. iii. 13); or, as Paul says in II. Cor. v. 21, God makes Him to be sin for us. On the other hand, God's grace towards sinners is shown in that, contrary to the ordinary forms of religion, in which men by sacrifice seek to propitiate their gods, in the case of Christ's sacrifice, God Himself sets forth the propitiation, and gives Christ to die for us (Rom. iii. 25, v. 8).

As effective in the justification and reconciliation of sinners, Paul calls the death of Christ their redemption (Rom. iii. 24). It delivers from the curse or condemnation of the law (Gal. iii. 13), which is the anticipation of the Divine judgment; and this deliverance takes place by the payment of a price (I. Cor. vi. 20). It is

evident, therefore, that Paul has in view the idea of expiatory sacrifice, which we have already observed in the books of Maccabees. Yet that he has not a purely objective and external transaction in view, is clear from many suggestive touches in his treatment of the subject. Above all, Paul never treats of the expiatory sacrifice of Christ without either the implication or the direct mention of the subjective realisation of salvation as faith, in close connection with it. This connection with faith is implied in such phrases as "for me" (Gal. ii. 20), "for us" (Rom. v. 8; II. Cor. v. 21). They recognise that the purpose of Christ dying, or of God in giving Him to die, was not merely to make satisfaction to a broken law, but to win grateful hearts to trust and love. The objective connections of Christ's death, that is, are never separated in Pauline thought from its subjective connections in Christian experience. In other passages we have direct mention of faith in the enunciation of the doctrine of the sacrifice of Christ, *e.g.* in Rom. iii. 24, where, even in expressly stating the connection between the sacrifice of Christ and the condemnation of sin, Paul emphasises at the outset the connection of Christ's sacrifice with faith. Observe the close connection of the words, "whom God set forth to be a propitiation through faith by His blood,"

and notice how the idea of faith is introduced into the very middle of the enunciation of the idea of expiatory sacrifice, actually separating the words "propitiation" and "by His blood" from one another.

The explanation of all this is found, when we observe that Paul regards the death of Christ not as exclusive but as inclusive of the death of the Christian (compare II. Cor. iii. 14: "we thus judge, that one died for all, therefore all died").

Nor is it only Christ's death that is inclusive of the death of His people, but also His resurrection includes their resurrection. Thus Paul says (Rom. iv. 24) that Christ was "raised for our justification." In other words, as Christ's death was the expiation for our sin in that it carried our deaths along with it, so also Christ's resurrection, or entrance on the state of heavenly blessedness, in that it includes the same entrance on heavenly blessedness for His people, is their justification or admission to full communion with God, who recognises their right to communion with Him by admitting them into His glorious kingdom.

The connection of justification in this way with the resurrection of Christ, it may be observed, finally makes impossible the identification of Paul's view of the atonement with the transactional view, according to which

the atonement consists simply in the payment of the debt of sin by Christ's death. Compare Rom. x. 9, where salvation is said to turn on a belief in Christ's resurrection. Above all, however, see I. Cor. xv. 14, where it is asserted that if Christ be not raised from the dead we are yet in our sins. This last passage makes it quite clear that the Pauline view of the atonement is not simply that of the payment of the debt of sin by the death of Christ; for this might take place without the resurrection, while Paul here says that apart from the resurrection there is no salvation. However difficult, therefore, it may be to reconcile in one view all that Paul says of the atonement, our work here is, as historical theologians, simply to observe the richness and manifoldness of his teaching, and to resist all premature attempts at its simplification. It is clear, on the one hand, that Paul held that Christ's death was an expiation for sin; but, on the other, that in His death and resurrection He was inclusive of His people, and that His resurrection was equally necessary with His death to our justification.

The reason, of course, for the inclusiveness of Christ in His death and resurrection is that His people are united to Him by faith (compare Gal. ii. 20, where crucifixion with Christ and new life in Him are equated

to a life of faith in Him). This thought, however, carries us over to the second hemisphere of the Pauline conception of present salvation, to which the ideas, which we have just been considering, form a bridge, showing that the two hemispheres are not really separate from one another.

§ 14. UNION WITH CHRIST VIEWED IN REFERENCE TO SIN

The subject of union with Christ has already been treated of in its prospective aspect, and the identity of the various forms in which Paul speaks of it has been demonstrated. It remains now to consider the way in which those ideas, viz. those of the gift of the Spirit and of the union of the believer with Christ, are developed in their retrospective aspect, *i.e.* with relation to the idea of sin. By means of them Paul finds place for an idea of salvation, not only from the guilt but from the power of sin.

It was seen that his doctrine of man left us with a fatal subjugation of his higher nature to his lower nature, his mind or inner man approving and desiring to obey the law of God, but his flesh rebelling and proving itself the victor. Paul now regards the Spirit,

bestowed on the Christian as the earnest of his inheritance, as an *ethical* power, which controverts the flesh, and is able to defeat it. That Paul was able thus to conceive the Spirit as an ethical power was due to the way in which he identified the Spirit of God and the Spirit of Christ. In opposition to the non-ethical view of the Spirit, according to which the Spirit is simply supernatural power, which, found in the Old Testament, was prevalent in the early Church, and which evaluated especially the abnormal as the spiritual, and also regarded the visitations of the Spirit as temporary and occasional, Paul set the view according to which the Spirit was the abiding power of Christian character, whose fruits were the virtues, the chief of which was love. This is one of Paul's greatest achievements, and can only be rightly estimated by a perception of the contrast between his view and the one he aimed to supersede. For an illustration of the older view, therefore, compare Judges xv. 14. For its prevalence in the early Church see I. Cor. xii. 1–3, xiv. 1–40, whence it is evident that the Corinthians viewed as spiritual rather abnormal manifestations like the gift of tongues, or speech unintelligible to the hearers, than prophecy or intelligible speech directed to the edification of the Church, and that they even

seem to have gone so far as to think that the man under the influence of the Spirit might invert all the ordinary moral and spiritual distinctions, so that, for instance, one in the Spirit might say, "Jesus is anathema" (I. Cor. xii. 3). For Paul's view see I. Cor. xii.–xiv., especially I. Cor. xiii. 13; compare Gal. v. 22.

Equally clearly is the idea of salvation as an ethical power brought to view under the notion of union with Christ in Rom. vi. 1–vii. 6. Here the death and resurrection of Christ are given a completely ethical meaning, which is brought out under many varied and changing figures. His death was a death to sin—terminating, in fact, the relations between Him and sin altogether. See Rom. vi. 7: "he that is dead is justified from sin," *i.e.* sin has no longer any claims upon him: the principle is applied to Christ. Again, Christ's death being a resurrection to the heavenly life with God (which is one of righteousness; compare Matt. v. 6), is a resurrection to God and righteousness (see Rom. vi. 10). But in the death and resurrection of Christ we have seen that all Christians share. In Rom. vi. 3–6, Paul shows this by means of the significance of baptism, and goes on to argue in the following verses that Christ's people are, or should be, in consequence of their union with Him, dead to sin and alive

to righteousness, thus exhibiting salvation as a moral power. "Reckon yourselves," he says, "to be dead unto sin, but alive unto God in Christ Jesus" (Rom. vi. 4).

The "are or should be" mentioned just now prepares the way for us to speak of the subjective realisation of this aspect of salvation. Just as justification is realised in faith or trust, so also is the new life of the Spirit received by faith (Gal. ii. 20, iii. 2) or baptism (Rom. vi. 3, 4; I. Cor. xii. 13). To baptism, in fact, Paul seems in this connection to attach independent value; and it is probable that to him it was more than a mere symbol of faith—that, in fact, he thought of it as actually conveying the gift of the Spirit and as actually uniting with Christ. This may to us perhaps seem inconsistent with his view that the Spirit is received by faith, and with the all-important position which he gives to faith in connection with justification. But it would seem probable that Paul never put to himself the question, so natural to us, What is the saving worth of faith apart from baptism? To him the one was the outer and the other the inner side of the same transaction, and hence he speaks of either as conveying the Spirit.

The new life, then, is appropriated by faith or in baptism. Whether, however, it is represented as the gift

of the Spirit or as union with Christ, Paul thinks of it as realised in the moral life of obedience. "If we live by the spirit," he says, "by the Spirit let us also walk" (Gal. v. 25). Or again to those united with Christ he says, "Present yourselves unto God, as alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness" (Rom. vi. 13). In these passages the description of what Christians "are" passes over immediately into the thought of what they "should be," to go back to the phraseology precisely made use of. Or, in philosophical language, the categorical affirmation immediately resolves itself into the categorical imperative. This is simply the result of the fact that Paul conceives the new life as altogether ethical, and an ethical life can never be realised apart from the obedience of the will.

This obedience of the will is, be it now observed, essentially the same attitude of soul as that spoken of in a different connection as faith. Faith and obedience are simply this one attitude of soul carried out in the different spheres of religion and ethics. The root of both is the surrender of the will to God, and both are expressed in the idea of sonship given by Jesus. The difference, in fact, between Jesus and Paul is that Paul much more than Jesus distinguishes the domains of religion and ethics, thus objectively dividing his idea

of salvation into the two hemispheres already considered, and subjectively dividing his method of the realisation of salvation into faith and obedience. Such a phrase, however, as that of the obedience of faith (Rom. i. 5) serves to illustrate the unity of the principle, whose operation is thus analytically explained.

§ 15. REACTION OF THE ETHICAL INTEREST UPON THE IDEA OF JUSTIFICATION

Paul's ordinary view of justification is, as we have seen, that in the present justification is the ground of a sure hope of final salvation. At the same time, in the moral interest, he holds strongly to the idea of a judgment according to works at the last day, as in the study of his eschatology we have already observed (see again Rom. ii. 6; Gal. vi. 7; II. Cor. v. 16, xi. 15). He constantly, in fact, urges upon Christians the necessity of being able to meet this judgment.

The two notions of present justification and a final judgment according to works may be reconciled by means of the conception of good works as the fruit of the Spirit (Gal. v. 23). Where justification is, there is also the gift of the Spirit, and therefore also good works. Thus the verdict of present justification and of the

future judgment must coincide. This view is virtually implied in Rom. v. 9, 10. Having been justified in Christ's blood, we shall be saved from the wrath, *i.e.* the wrath of God at the last Judgment, by His life, or by union with Him. This can only be because union with Christ results in the fruit of good works required for salvation at the last Judgment.

Sometimes, however, the ethical interest so predominates that Paul even comes to represent future salvation as conditional on perseverance in faith and obedience. Compare Rom. viii. 17, still more I. Cor. ix. 24–27, where Paul speaks even of his own final salvation as depending on his perseverance. Above all, see Phil. iii. 8–14, where Paul speaks of the righteousness of justification through faith in Christ as requiring to be realised through union with Christ in His death and resurrection, and makes the attainment of the resurrection from the dead, *i.e.* final salvation, dependent upon this realisation.

§ 16. INDIVIDUALISM OF THE PAULINE SOTERIOLOGY

With the general abandonment of the idea of the kingdom of God in reference to present salvation in favour of the conceptions of justification, reconciliation,

adoption, the gift of the Spirit, the individual character of salvation comes strongly to the front in the teaching of Paul. The social element in salvation is, however, constantly implied in the "we," "us," and "our," which Paul continually uses in speaking of these subjects (Rom. iv. 25, v. 1, 8, viii. 15, 16, 31–39); while in I. Cor. xii. 13 Paul emphasises the oneness of the Spirit which all Christians have received, by means of which they are all united into one body. It is by means of this figure of the one body that Paul especially teaches the same truth of the social character of salvation which Jesus teaches through the idea of the kingdom of God. It is led up to not only, as in I. Cor. xii. 13, by the conception of salvation as the reception of the Spirit, but still more by the notion of it as union with Christ. Those who are one with Christ are essentially one with one another; they are a body of which He is the head and they are the members. The complete synthesis of the salvation of the community and of the individual, which we found in the teaching of Jesus, is then not lost by Paul, though brought to view in a somewhat different way.

§ 17. THE DOCTRINE OF PRESENT SALVATION IN COLOSSIANS AND EPHESIANS

In these epistles the ideas of present salvation, which we have just been studying in connection with the great central group of Paul's epistles, receive considerable modification, though certainly along lines not altogether unprepared for. We note, first of all, that the great controversial name "justification," by which Paul defines his view of salvation regarded as the right to communion with God in opposition to the Pharisaic doctrine, disappears from Colossians and Ephesians; and along with it also almost entirely disappears the doctrine of the law and its inability to save. We still find, however, the descriptions of salvation as reconciliation (Col. i. 21) and as adoption (Eph. i. 5). Paul also speaks in the language of direct experience of access to God, just as in Rom. v. 2 (see Eph. ii. 18). Twice this aspect of salvation is described as the forgiveness of sins (Eph. i. 7; Col. i. 14); which however, it will be remembered, we saw from Rom. iv. 5–7 was the equivalent of justification in Paul's mind in the central stage of his thought. In another place (Col. i. 13) the same aspect of salvation is spoken of as a translation out of the kingdom of darkness into

the kingdom of the Son of God's love; and here is the nearest equivalent to the description of salvation in the central epistles as freedom from the law. For Colossians completes that separation between the law and God, which in spite of the doctrine of Rom. vii. that the law is holy, just and good, we found begun in Gal. iii. 14, where it is said that the law was given by angels; so that it appears as representing God not directly, but through the medium of inferior powers. In Col. ii. 14, 15, we find the power behind the law viewed not merely as that of angels, but of hostile angels, who hold in the law a bond against sinful humanity, which Christ by His death, which satisfies the claim of the law, cancels, and thus redeems mankind from the power of these hostile angels, over whom He thereby triumphs. Here, then, we find the meaning of the translation out of the power of darkness into the kingdom of Christ spoken of in Col. i. 13. It means the deliverance of believers from the power of the hostile angels of the law into a state of salvation, here described, with a natural modification of the original name of the kingdom of God, as the kingdom of Christ.

As regards the second Pauline aspect of salvation, we find in Colossians and Ephesians the frequent recog-

nition of the gift of the Spirit. The earnest of the Spirit (Eph. i. 14)—we saw that this phrase exactly sums up Paul's characteristic view of the gift of the Spirit—is the common possession of Christians. We have also descriptions of salvation as a quickening together with Christ (Eph. ii. 5), as a burial with Christ and resurrection with Him (Col. ii. 12, iii. 1), and again as Christ in us (Col. i. 27; Eph. iii. 17), which remind us of the central epistles. We have also fresh description of salvation as perfection (Col. ii. 10) or as purification (Eph. v. 20), which connect our epistles with Hebrews and the Johannine writings rather than with the Pauline central epistles. Pfleiderer has endeavoured to show in his "Paulinism," Eng. trans., vol. ii. pp. 95 ff., 162 ff., that all these descriptions, however, apparently corresponding to the second aspect of salvation in Paul's central doctrine, excepting only the idea of the gift of the Spirit, are in reality used in a religious rather than in a moral sense, *i.e.*, to describe the necessary preparation for admission to communion with God. In this he tries to show an agreement of Colossians and Ephesians with Hebrews and John as against Galatians, Romans, Corinthians, and Philippians. His exegesis must be studied in detail to be appreciated. What is probably true, however,

is that in Ephesians and Colossians the sharp distinction between the two Pauline hemispheres of salvation has disappeared, and thus descriptions properly belonging to the one aspect are immediately connected with those belonging to the other in a way not so often found in the earlier epistles. This is due to the fact that the doctrinal treatment of salvation in Colossians and Ephesians is dominated no longer by the necessities of the anti-Judaistic controversy, but by the interests of practical morality, just as we shall also find is the case in I. Peter.

§ 18. SALVATION AS MEDIATED THROUGH CHRIST IN COLOSSIANS AND EPHESIANS

It is, as in the second group of epistles, central that salvation is mediated through Christ. Both access to God and the gift of the Spirit are through Him (Eph. i. 13, 14; Col. i. 14). Even greater emphasis than before falls upon His Person. Whereas in Romans and Corinthians God reconciles us to Himself by the sacrifice of Christ (Rom. iii. 25, 26; II. Cor. v. 21), here Christ Himself personally reconciles us to God (Col. i. 22; Eph. ii. 16).

The sacrifice of Christ appears under two new points of view. One has already been touched upon. The

power behind the law is conceived as that of hostile angels, whose bond against men is cancelled by the satisfaction made to the law in Christ's death (Col. ii. 14, 15). What is new in this view is that the satisfaction no longer appears to be made to God, but rather to a power more or less independent of Him. The element previously represented as the "wrath" of God being thus objectified into independence, we are led naturally to a second view of the death of Christ. When it is spoken of in Eph. v. 2 as a sacrifice to God it is no longer thought of as a propitiatory sacrifice, but as a free-will offering whose acceptability consists in its moral nature, viz. in the love which prompted it.

It is further to be observed that, in Ephesians, great emphasis falls on the social aspect of salvation. It is the Church as a whole for which Christ sacrifices Himself (Eph. v. 25); it is the Church as a whole to which the Spirit is given (Eph. iv. 4). In a word, it is the Church as a whole that is the sphere of salvation, and individuals are saved by membership of it.

§ 19. THE SUBJECTIVE REALISATION OF SALVATION IN COLOSSIANS AND EPHESIANS

We find in our epistles the idea of faith made use of just in the same way as in the central group. Faith

mediates on the one hand peace with God and access to Him (Eph. iii. 12), and on the other hand the indwelling of Christ in the heart (Eph. iii. 17). At the same time, we recognise a tendency, which goes along with the greater emphasis on the Church, to objectify faith into "the faith" of the Church (Col. i. 23; Eph. iv. 13). Along with this objectification of faith goes emphasis on a different subjective element. When faith is objectified as "the faith," the subjective faculty by which this objectified faith is received, viz. the intellect, rises into prominence; and thus we find in our epistles a markedly increased stress on knowledge (Eph. i. 17 f., iv. 13 f.). As, however, knowledge corresponds to only the intellectual aspect of the old subjective conception of faith, the idea, formerly expressed by the moral side of (subjective) faith, requires a new embodiment. Hence, while it is asserted just as strongly as before that salvation is not by works or merit (Eph. ii. 9), we find developed in our epistles the conception of "good works," as the divinely appointed way of salvation (Eph. ii. 10).

CHAPTER VI

THE PASTORAL EPISTLES

We may begin our account of the doctrine of salvation in the Pastoral Epistles with a reference to the doctrine of God, so far as it bears on the subject. These epistles emphasise God's grace, His love to men, His goodness and mercy (Titus ii. 4, iii. 4 f.). God is also frequently described as "Saviour" (I. Tim. i. 1, ii. 3; II. Tim. i. 9; Titus ii. 10, iii. 4). Finally, His willingness to save all men is expressly asserted (I. Tim. ii. 4).

Salvation, both present and future, is mediated through Jesus Christ. In I. Tim. vi. 14; II. Tim. iv. 1, 8; Titus ii. 13, we have references to Christ's expected "manifestation," *i.e.* His second coming. Then will Christ's kingdom come (II. Tim. iv. 1). The elect will obtain salvation with Him in eternal glory (II. Tim. i. 10), will live and reign with Christ (II. Tim. ii. 11, 12).

It is, however, characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles, that the term "manifestation" is used not only of the second coming of Christ, but of His historical appearance

in the world, as the ground of the present salvation, which Christians already enjoy (see Titus ii. 11, iii. 4). This salvation is referred to, in thoroughly Pauline language, as justification by God's grace (Titus iii. 7), not by our works of righteousness (Titus iii. 5); while, on the other hand, in close agreement with Pauline ideas, though not in Pauline language, it is spoken of as regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which has been poured out by God upon Christians through Jesus Christ (Titus iii. 5, 6). But it is characteristic of the Pastoral Epistles that the tendency observable in Phil. iii. 8–11, to make justification dependent upon internal righteousness, is still more developed in them. In Titus iii. 4–7 it will be observed that, not only does the mention of regeneration precede that of justification, but that justification appears to take place through regeneration.

In accordance with this stress on inherent righteousness, we find further, that the terms "redemption" and "purification" are both used to describe salvation in the sense, not of justification or admission to communion with God, but in the sense of moral renewal; and this moral renewal is represented as the purpose of Christ's death (Titus ii. 14).

As regards the subjective appropriation of salvation, faith ceases to occupy in the Pastoral Epistles that place which it has in the typical Paulinism. It has become either "the faith" of the Church, or one Christian virtue among many, no longer the subjective root of the whole Christian life. See for the first case I. Tim. i. 19, vi. 10, 12; for the second I. Tim. i. 5, 14, ii. 7, iv. 12. The place of the Pauline idea of faith is largely taken by the idea of godliness, which means on the one hand the piety, on the other hand the good moral life, which characterise the Christian Church, in contrast with the vain speculations and loose life of heretics (see I. Tim. vi. 3–5; II. Tim. iii. 1–5). We have in all these changes a further development along the lines already observed in Colossians, and more particularly Ephesians, only to be explained by the ever-increasing stress on the Church as the sphere of salvation, and the authority alike for faith and morals (I. Tim. iii. 5). The development of the idea of the Church, however, is again to be explained by the special dangers which Christianity had to face when the Pastoral Epistles were written. The opponents to be met were no longer, as in the case of Paul's central epistles, Judaisers teaching justification by works, but Gnostic heretics, teaching

a libertinism, based on Paul's own principles that the law is transcended for Christians (I. Tim. i. 7–10). Against this false doctrine and unsound morals a bulwark was found in the common faith and practice of the Christian Church, which was "sound" and good (I. Tim vi. 3; II. Tim. i. 13, iv. 3). It is especially on the moral life that the emphasis falls; and thus we find the demand of Colossians and Ephesians for good works taken up and made even stronger (Titus iii. 8, 14). There is no salvation apart from good works (Titus ii. 14); though Titus iii. 4–7, like Eph. ii. 10, repeats, as we have seen, the Pauline doctrine that salvation is not by merit. But the ethical interest reacts so strongly upon the doctrine of salvation, that it is emphasised in the strongest language that final salvation is conditional (II. Tim. ii. 11–12). It is evident that we have moved a good way here from the Pauline central epistles; though the passages already referred to in them, like Phil. iii. 8–11, and after these Colossians and Ephesians, form a continuous bridge to the doctrine of the Pastoral Epistles.

CHAPTER VII

I. PETER

ESCHATOLOGY is very prominent in I. Peter. Writing at a time of persecution, Peter encourages his readers to look forward to the "salvation ready to be revealed in the last time" (i. 5), which is to be inaugurated by the revelation of Jesus Christ (i. 7, v. 4), and the judgment of the world. Though, in general, God appears as the judge of men (i. 17, ii. 23), the final judgment is expressly assigned to Christ (iv. 5), who will judge both the living and the dead, (iv. 5), the righteous and the wicked (iv. 17). Those who are approved will inherit eternal glory (v. 10), receive the crown of glory (v. 4), and live a life of immortality (i. 4).

A peculiar element in the Petrine doctrine of redemption is the hope held out that some may be saved, who are beyond the sphere of this life. In iii. 19–21 we hear of a preaching by Christ to the spirits in prison, which were formerly disobedient in the days of Noah.

"This phrase," says Charles ("Eschatology," col. 1380), "can be interpreted only in two ways. The spirits in question are either those of men in Sheol, or the fallen angels mentioned in II. Pet. ii. 4; Jude 6. In the next place the words 'in prison' denote the local condition of the spirits at the time of preaching. Hence according to the text, Christ 'in the spirit' (*i.e.* between His death and His resurrection) preached the Gospel of redemption to human or angelic spirits in the underworld." Again in iv. 5 we read, "who will have to give account to Him that is ready to judge the living and the dead. For with this purpose was the Gospel preached even to the dead, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the spirit." Of this difficult passage Charles gives the following interpretation: "The doctrine we found stated above in iii. 19–21 is here substantiated, as being part of the larger truth now enumerated. Christ is ready to judge the living and the dead—the latter no less than the former; for even to the dead was the Gospel preached, in order that though they were judged in the body, they might live the life of God in the spirit. Thus it is taught that, when the last Judgment takes place, the Gospel will have been preached to all. As to

how far this preaching of redemption succeeds there is no hint in the Petrine teaching." Charles points out the extreme importance of these isolated passages. "They attest the achievement of the final stage in the moralisation of Sheol." The first stage in this moralisation took place when, in the second century B.C., Sheol became a place no longer merely of social or external distinctions, but of moral distinctions. But this moralisation of Sheol remained inadequate. The very idea of moral life is that of progress. This idea, however, was not attained as far as Sheol was concerned. According to Jewish theology, followed in general by the New Testament, souls in Sheol were regarded as incapable of moral change. What they were, when they entered Sheol, that they remained till the final Judgment. The Petrine passages give an outlook into possibilities beyond the limits of this general conception, which are of the greatest importance for a true idea of the relation between God and man.

We turn to the conception of present salvation in I. Peter. What we find is in practical agreement with the ideas of Paul, without, however, the dialectical sharpness of his theological distinctions. We enjoy in the present communion with God through the work of

Christ, "who suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous" (iii. 18). So also the elect are sprinkled with the blood of Christ (i. 2) *i.e.* brought into communion with God by His sacrifice. Much more closely, however, than in Paul there is connected with the sacrifice of Christ the idea of salvation as moral regeneration. The blood of Christ redeems from the vain manner of life handed down from the past (i. 18). Christ bore our sins in His own body on the tree, that we, having died unto sins, might live unto righteousness (ii. 24). In these passages the effect of the sacrifice of Christ is described in a way unlike the characteristic thought of Paul, in which it appears as resulting directly in moral renewal. In the latter passage, particularly, we seem to have the two Pauline lines of thought united in one. We are not told, however, in I. Peter how the blood of Christ redeems from vain manner of life, or how His sacrifice results in a death unto sin and a life unto righteousness. The Pauline doctrine would seem to be presupposed; Peter simply makes edificatory use of its phrases, without, however, observing the niceties of Pauline theology, with its sharp distinction of the two sides of salvation. Compare further the general agreement with Paul, when it is said that we are regenerated

through Christ's resurrection (i. 3), just as Paul describes salvation as resurrection with Christ and new life in union with Him; also when it is said that the Spirit of God rests upon Christians (iv. 14), and that they are elect unto sanctification of the Spirit (i. 1, 2), just as Paul makes salvation consist in the gift of the Spirit and moral renewal by Him.

The difference from Paul appears most strongly when we come to the subjective conception corresponding to the objective idea just mentioned. The notion of faith is totally different from that of Paul. The idea of faith as personal trust in Christ, especially as mystical union with Christ, is not to be found. Faith appears rather as belief in the promises of God sustained by the resurrection of Christ, and practically is little different from hope (i. 21), except only that it rests upon the resurrection as a firm ground, so that its hope is a living hope (i. 3).

The other element in the subjective appropriation of salvation is baptism. With this, viewed not as a mere external ceremony, but on its spiritual side, salvation is closely connected (iii. 21). Thus much is clear; though the exact meaning of the difficult phrase, translated in the R.V. "the interrogation of a good conscience towards God," is hard to determine.

CHAPTER VIII

HEBREWS

§ 1. THE IDEAS OF SALVATION

THE doctrine of the Epistle to the Hebrews is in many ways parallel with that of I. Peter. Eschatology is again much in the foreground, and the deviations from Paul in the idea of present salvation closely resemble those of I. Peter. But the whole doctrine of the epistle is systematised, in a way altogether lacking in I. Peter, by the influence of a fresh conception, derived from the Alexandrian philosophy.

We begin with the idea of future salvation. The reward of the righteous is to be in heaven (vi. 19 f.), where they have an eternal inheritance (ix. 15), a better country (xi. 16), a city which is to come (xiii. 14), whose builder and maker is God (xi. 9 f.). The blessedness of the righteous is described as a participation in the glory of God (ii. 10), and in the Divine vision (xii. 14).

This salvation is to be brought about at the appearance of Christ unto salvation (ix. 28). The resurrection appears to be reserved for the righteous only. "This follows from xi. 35, 'that they might obtain a better resurrection.' These words, which refer to the Maccabæan martyrs (II. Macc. vii.), set the resurrection in contrast with a merely temporal deliverance from death, and represent it as a prize to be striven for, not as the common lot of all" (Charles, "Eschatology," col. 1378). The judgment is simultaneous with the second coming of Christ; but He does not judge (ix. 27 f., x. 37). God is the judge (x. 30), the judge of all (xii. 23). The wicked are doomed to destruction (x. 39), something far worse than bodily death (ix. 27), and represented as a consuming fire (x. 27, xii. 29; *cf.* vi. 8). The Day of Judgment is near at hand (x. 25). It will be introduced by a final shaking of the heaven and the earth (xii. 26; *cf.* xii. 25, 29).

Thus far we have no specially peculiar features in the doctrine of Hebrews. The Alexandrian element, however, which was previously mentioned, appears in the conception that this heavenly salvation is not only future, but already exists in the present in the unseen world; so that the passing away of the present

world will only be the unveiling of what now truly is, "the removing of those things that are shaken, that those things that are not shaken may remain." The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews identifies the sphere of the Christian salvation with the Alexandrian idea of the intelligible world, which lies beyond the senses, and is in the first place the opposite of this present world. "That is to say, it is related to the latter (this creation, ix. 11), as the original sanctuary, which Moses saw in heaven, is related to the earthly one which he prepared according to that pattern, or as the original, which in its essence is Divine, heavenly, supersensuous, perfect, and eternal, is related to the finite and the sensuous, which is merely an imperfect copy and likeness, traced from the shadow of the Divine pattern (viii. 1–5, ix. 23), and is distinguished as the visible (ix. 3), tangible (xii. 18), changeable, that can be shaken, from the original pattern, which is the invisible (ix. 1), that cannot be shaken (xi. 27), and eternal. As the dwelling-place of God this higher world is called the house of God (ix. 21), the true tabernacle (viii. 2), the city which has firm foundations (ix. 10), the fatherland, the heavenly city (ix. 14, 16), Zion the mountain and city of the living

God, the heavenly Jerusalem (xii. 22), and finally the kingdom which cannot be shaken" (Pfleiderer, "Paulinism," ii. p. 56: the Greek quotations are rendered into English). From this identification of the Messianic kingdom of primitive Christian hope with the higher world of Greek speculation, follows a noteworthy result. Since, in a true sense, the Messianic kingdom already exists in heaven, Christians are even in this world partakers of the Messianic salvation. We are already come to Mount Zion, the heavenly Jerusalem, already in this world are enrolled among its citizens (xii. 22, 23), and already receive and enjoy its gifts and powers (vi. 4, 5, xii. 28). It only requires faith in the unseen world to realise this (xi. 1); as the writer of Hebrews urges by the example of the long line of the heroes of faith in the magnificent eleventh chapter of the epistle. The Christian salvation, then, is not only a future hope, but a present possession. The Christian is already "perfected" (x. 14), even in this life: thus the writer expresses in his own way the doctrine of present salvation in practical agreement with Jesus and with Paul.

§ 2. THE MEDIATION OF SALVATION THROUGH CHRIST

In its form, however, the doctrine of present salvation in Hebrews is very different from that of either Jesus or Paul, resembling most closely the doctrine of I. Peter. This arises from the peculiar controversial character of the epistle, the point of which is to prove that Christianity, in opposition to Judaism, is the true form of Divine worship, the proof being accomplished by the opposition of Christianity, as belonging to the real and unseen world, and thus eternal in its nature, to Judaism, as belonging merely to the present world of sense, and thus only transitory in character. As a result of this purpose of the epistle, however, the form in which the value of Christianity is expressed is conditioned by that of the religion opposed to it, *i.e.* the benefits of Christianity are expressed in terms of the ceremonial law. Thus the author of Hebrews expresses the doctrine that in Christianity we have communion with God by saying, not that we are justified, but that we are perfected, sanctified, or cleansed. The means of this cleansing is the sacrifice of Christ, on which the writer lays great stress, in opposition to the Jewish

sacrifices. They could only procure a ceremonial and external cleansing; it procures the true cleansing of the heart. They had to be repeated; it has been offered once and for all. See on the whole subject (ix. 1–x. 25). The writer does not explain how the sacrifice of Christ cleanses. The cleansing power of sacrifice was no doubt axiomatic for him, as for the ancient world in general, and the effect of the work of Christ in this respect seemed sufficiently explained by the simple analogy of His death with the Jewish sacrifices, the differences between them being taken into account. If, however, the writer of Hebrews has given us little help in this direction towards an understanding of the effect of the work of Christ, in another respect he has made a great contribution to the New Testament doctrines on the subject. This is by his conception that the worth to God of Christ's sacrifice consisted in His obedience (x. 5–9; compare Eph. v. 2). Another noteworthy saying on the subject in Hebrews is that it was by the Eternal Spirit that Christ offered Himself to God (ix. 14). In general it is not so much the passive side of Christ's sacrifice, that in which He appears as a victim, but rather the active side, that in which He appears as the sacrificing priest, on which our author

dwells. Christ having made purification of sins (i. 3), has entered into the eternal world, there for ever presenting Himself before God as high priest on behalf of those who come to God through Him (iv. 14–v. 10, vii. 25–viii. 6). The author of Hebrews has further connected this high-priestly work of Christ not only with His obedient offering of His death, but also with His obedient offering of His whole life (v. 7–9); so that in these respects the evangelical picture of Jesus receives fuller interpretation than it does from Paul.

The barrier to communion with God, which is removed by the cleansing or sanctification of the Christian, is that of sin. The author of Hebrews does not, however, like Paul, dwell on the objective side of the barrier, the curse of the law, the wrath of God, and so on, but thinks rather of the subjective side of it, the conscience of sins (x. 2, 22). He does, indeed, in his own way, recognise the objective side also by the view that the death of Christ delivers men from the power of death and the devil. Here we have a parallel to that development of Pauline thought in Gal. iii. 19; Col. ii. 14, 15, in which the barrier imposed by the curse of the law is separated from the Divine will, and regarded as located in the

angelic powers who gave the law and enforce its claims. In Hebrews for the hostile angels and their claims is substituted the devil and his power of death. Yet even in this view the author of Hebrews shows his subjectivity by emphasising especially as that from which men are delivered, not death itself, but the fear of it (see on the whole ii. 14, 15).

There is no mystical doctrine of salvation by union with Christ in Hebrews. On the contrary, Christ rather appears as the moral example of Christians, the "leader" of their faith (xii. 1–3). In agreement with this, the presentation of the subjective side of salvation is very different from that of Paul. Faith in Hebrews means, not as in Paul's epistles, personal trust in Christ and mystical union with Him, but rather, as in I. Peter, a firm conviction of unseen realities, differing only from hope in that it rests on an assured basis of Divine promise (xi. 1).

CHAPTER IX

THE APOCALYPSE

In this book it is the future aspect of salvation which is almost exclusively dominant. The book is written to encourage Christians, in face of fierce persecution, to hold fast their religion in view of their coming deliverance and of the coming judgment of the hostile powers, who persecute them. Charles distinguishes four principal heads of doctrine as to future salvation in the Apocalypse. These are : (*a*) the Parusia and the Messianic judgment ; (*b*) the first resurrection, the Millennium, the uprising and destruction of Gog and Magog ; (*c*) the general resurrection and judgment ; (*d*) the final consummation of the righteous.

With regard to (*a*), it is to be observed that every visitation of the churches is regarded as a spiritual coming of the Messiah (ii. 5, 16, iii. 3, 20) ; but beyond this the apocalyptic writer proclaims the speedy final advent of Christ, visible to all (i. 7, iii. 11). This ends

in the judgment of the hostile powers, which are destroyed (xvi. 16, xix. 20, 21). After this follow (*b*) the first resurrection and the Millennium. Satan is chained: the martyrs, and the martyrs only, rise and reign with Christ on the earth a thousand years (xx. 4–6), Jerusalem being the centre of the kingdom. Then Satan is loosed: Gog and Magog, the terrible enemies of the kingdom of God, foretold by Ezekiel (Ezek. xxxviii. 2, xxxix. 16), make an attack upon the millennial kingdom. They are, however, destroyed by God Himself with fire from heaven (xx. 9); and the devil is finally cast into the lake of fire (xx. 10). (*c*) The present heaven and earth pass away (xx. 11); and all are raised to judgment before God, being judged according to their works, as recorded in the heavenly books (xx. 12). The wicked, with Death and Hades, are cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death (xx. 14, xxi. 8). (*d*) There is then a new heaven and a new earth (xxi. 1, 5); and the heavenly city, Jerusalem, descends upon the earth (xxi. 10–21). "The ideal kingdom of God becomes actual. The city needs no temple: God and Christ (the Lamb) dwell in it (xxi. 22). The citizens dwell in perfect fellowship with God, and are as kings unto God (xxii. 5). The Messiah does not resign His mediatorial functions, as in the

Pauline eschatology (xxi. 21 f.)." (Charles, "Eschatology," col. 1377.)

As regards present salvation, naturally in a book, where the whole gaze is so strained towards the future, not very much is said. But deliverance from sins by the blood of Christ, who is the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world (xiii. 8; compare v. 6) is mentioned as a privilege, not only of the future (v. 9, vii. 14), but also of the present (i. 5); and Christians are already kings and priests unto God (i. 6). Subjectively the condition of salvation is faith, which, however, in the Apocalypse means, much as in Hebrews, the firm conviction of the truth of the Christian religion, issuing in patience under affliction and persecution (xiii. 10). Repentance also is required, where there has been backsliding, as in the case of the church at Ephesus (ii. 5).

CHAPTER X

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

"THE entire content of the Epistle of James," says Titius, "is monotheism, eschatology, and ethics" (*Die neutestamentliche Lehre von der Seligkeit,* iv. 117). The advent of the Messiah, who will judge the world, is close at hand (v. 8). He alone can save or destroy (iv. 12). The faithful will enter into the promised kingdom (ii. 5). A fire will consume the wicked (v. 3). They will be delivered to the death, not only of the body but of the soul (v. 20).

Upon what grounds, then, is the decision made between the saved and the unsaved? Not, says James, here in sharp contrast with Paul, on the ground of faith apart from works. On the contrary, faith apart from works is dead (ii. 20). By faith, however, James understands simply an intellectual conviction of unseen reality, especially of the unity of God (ii. 19). This he says, apart from works, cannot save (ii. 14). James thinks of Christianity as a new law, different, indeed, from the old

law, in that it is a law of liberty (*i.e.* is freely obeyed), but still a law, according to which men are judged (ii. 12). James does not, indeed, deny that God's mercy is a factor in the judgment. On the contrary, none can fulfil the law perfectly (iii. 2), and so claim the "crown of life" as a reward. But God's very justice means that He will show mercy as a just recompense to the merciful. "Judgment is without mercy to him that hath showed no mercy: mercy glorieth against judgment" (ii. 13).

As regards present salvation, justification is conceived as anticipated in the present (ii. 21, 25), just as by Paul. This must mean for James, with his presuppositions, however, that there is a present justification to him who proves his faith by his works, so long as he continues to do so. The forgiveness of sins also is spoken of as to be enjoyed in the present (v. 15).

It is noteworthy that there is in James no reference at all to the work of Christ. Practically the only recognition of the mediation of salvation through Him is the recognition of Him as the coming Messiah (ii. 1), who can save or destroy in the Day of Judgment (iv. 12). It may be added that James presents in brief outline a doctrine of sin in close agreement with the Pauline doctrine (see especially i. 14, 15).

It is further, according to James, the work of the law to convict men of sin. James agrees entirely with Paul as to the absolute demand of the law (ii. 10). Here the law referred to is the Old Testament law, as the special precepts referred to show. The law against respect of persons (ii. 9) is to be found in Deut. i. 17, xvi. 19; while ii. 11 quotes the sixth and seventh commandments of the Decalogue (Exod. xx. 13, 14). James, however, seems to draw no very sharp distinction between the new law and the old law.

CHAPTER XI

JUDE AND II. PETER

THESE two epistles are closely connected together. Both are full of the expectation of the Parusia, which is to be a day of mercy unto eternal life for Christian believers (Jude 21), but a day of judgment upon all the ungodly (Jude 14, 15), including the rebel angels, who since their fall have been kept in everlasting bonds under darkness till the great day (Jude 6; *cf.* II. Pet. ii. 4). At the Parusia, moreover, the present earth will be destroyed by fire (II. Pet. iii. 10), giving place to a new heaven and earth, the habitation of righteousness (II. Pet. iii. 13). Future salvation is spoken of as a participation in the Divine nature (II. Pet. i. 4). A peculiar feature of II. Peter is its teaching on the delay of the Parusia. It appears that this delay had caused some to mock and others to doubt (II. Pet. iii. 1–9). The difficulty is met by the principle that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a

thousand years as one day (II. Pet. iii. 8); also by the statement that the delay is a delay in mercy, intended to allow men more time for repentance (II. Pet. iii. 9).

As regards present salvation, this consists in hope, and the possession of the Spirit (Jude 20). II. Pet. i. 1 speaks of Christians, in semi-Pauline phraseology, as having obtained a precious faith in the righteousness of our God and Saviour Jesus Christ. Further on, however, faith appears as one among the many graces of the Christian life (II. Pet. i. 5); while in Jude 3, 20 "the faith" of the Church is spoken of. Both epistles urge strongly the necessity of the moral life. Forgiveness is thought of in II. Pet. i. 9 as taking place at baptism: after this it is incumbent on the Christian to make his final salvation certain by adding to his faith the practical virtues (II. Pet. i. 5–7). At the same time Jude 24 recognises that it is God alone who can keep His people from stumbling, and bring them to His eternal joy; while II. Peter equally affirms the necessity of the Divine grace, though this tends to be resolved into the communication of the knowledge of Christ (II. Pet. i. 2, 3, iii. 8).

CHAPTER XII

THE GOSPEL AND EPISTLES OF JOHN

§ 1. THE FUTURE SALVATION

THE writings of John above named bring to completion the tendency observable in the development of Christian thought by Paul, and also in Hebrews, to remove the emphasis from the idea of future to that of present salvation. We may regard this movement of thought on the one hand as an unfolding of what was latent in Christianity from the first, or as the liberation of the specifically Christian ideas from the Jewish forms in which they at first took shape in the teaching of Jesus. On the other hand, there is no doubt that the change was occasioned partly by the external course of events in the Christian Church. The delay of the Parusia made most necessary a presentation of Christianity, which should enable the Church to bear this delay with equanimity; and nothing can be more fitted for this purpose than the Johannine doctrine,

that the Christian salvation can be enjoyed in all essential points in the present. Nevertheless John retains the primitive Christian eschatology side by side with his own specific doctrine of salvation. The eschatological element is, however, very small in the Gospel: it is in I. John that it is principally to be found.

John repeats first of all the message that the Parusia is close at hand. It is foretold in John xiv. 3, where Jesus promised to return from heaven, and to take the disciples to be with Him where He is, *i.e.* in heaven. Some of the disciples are expected to survive till this consummation (xxi. 18). John himself in his extreme old age hopes to witness it, together with his disciples (I. John ii. 28). The present is the last hour (I. John ii. 18); as is evidenced by the appearance of Antichrist in the false teachers, who deny the fundamental truths of the Gospel. Such a manifestation must precede the Parusia (I. John ii. 18, 22, iv. 13). On the last day Jesus raises His own to the resurrection life (John vi. 39, 44, 54, xi. 25). In v. 28 it is taught that all the dead rise. Jesus Himself executes the final Judgment (v. 27). The resurrection is a resurrection of life to those who have done good, a resurrection of judgment to those

who have done ill (v. 29). After the resurrection and the final Judgment the present world passes away (I. John ii. 17), and Jesus takes His own to be with Him in heaven (John xii. 26, xiv. 25, xvii. 24). Thus beholding the face of God, they shall be transformed into the Divine likeness (I. John iii. 2).

§ 2. THE PRESENT SALVATION

In all this salvation appears as future, and therefore still as matter of hope (I. John iii. 3). We now, however, turn to what is really the dominant and characteristic teaching of the Johannine writings, viz. that in the present all the elements of the future consummation are in essence realised. "In a certain sense in the Johannine teaching the kingdom has already come, the Christ is already present, the faithful already risen, and the judgment already in fulfilment" (Charles, "Eschatology," col. 1378). John, indeed, hardly makes use of the primitive Christian name of the kingdom (see, however, John iii. 5, xviii. 36). Instead of this he uses what with Jesus Himself is an alternative name for the content of salvation, viz., eternal life. A central doctrine of John is that the Christian has eternal life

here and now. This is his most general account of the present salvation of the Christian. Further, he who has this eternal life cannot die. Not only shall he rise again in the resurrection at the last day (John xi. 24), but more than this, death cannot destroy his life (John xi. 25, 26). He has passed from death into life (John v. 24). Again, the judgment is anticipated here and now. One side of this idea is the Johannine equivalent of the Pauline doctrine of present justification. John expresses the Pauline idea that the believer is already justified in the still stronger form that he does not come into judgment at all (John v. 24; *cf.* iii. 17, 18). The reverse side of the Johannine doctrine of judgment, which corresponds to the Pauline teaching that the whole world is shut up under condemnation, is that the unsaved are judged already (John iii. 18). We shall return to this point later on.

In the Pauline system we found as an alternative expression for justification the idea of reconciliation. The justified are restored to communion with God, and have peace with Him. In John the matter is not presented exactly at this angle; but communion with God (and with Christ) is dwelt on, as an important element in salvation (I. John i. 3). John also differs

from Paul somewhat in representing salvation, not as a complete justification, but as a state of communion in which the believer still requires the renewal of the Divine forgiveness (I. John i. 9 ; *cf.* John xiii. 10).

We also found in the Pauline theology as another alternative for justification the idea of adoption. John also presents salvation as a state of sonship (I. John iii. 12); but, with a characteristic difference from Paul, does not make use of the name adoption. His idea is rather that of a new nature, than that of a new right. The Christian is born of God (i. 13), begotten of God (I. John iii. 9), born of the Spirit (John iii. 3–8). Hence John uses rather the phrase "children of God," which according to Greek usage suggests the community of nature between father and son, than "sons of God," which suggests similarly the right and privileges of sonship. An approach to the Pauline idea appears, according to the R.V. translation, in John i. 12: "to as many as received Him to them gave He the right to become children of God." Probably, however, we should rather translate here, more in harmony with the general Johannine point of view: "to them gave He the power to become children of God" (so Weizsäcker's translation).

The idea of sonship in John, then, approaches more

nearly to the Pauline mystical than to the Pauline judicial idea of salvation. Even in Paul the idea of sonship formed a bridge from the judicial to the mystical idea of salvation through the conception of the spirit of adoption received by the Christian. In John the idea of sonship has still further passed over to the mystical side.

We also find in John the immediate expression of the same mystical idea of salvation as in Paul. Salvation is union with Christ: He is in us, and we in Him (John xv. 4). But John goes even further than Paul, and thinks of it as union with God (John xvii. 20–23). In John, however, there is no such sharp distinction of the different aspects of salvation as in Paul. Rather do the latter shade off into one another; while they are all united together by the common idea of salvation as eternal life. "In general," says Titius, "the different views are not to be added up in order to obtain the correct picture of salvation as a whole; but each of these groups of ideas represents the whole salvation over again, certainly under a special point of view" (*Die neutestamentliche Lehre von der Saligkeit*, iii. p. 30).

Finally, however, we get no correct idea of the

Johannine conception of salvation, unless we observe the great stress laid on its ethical character. Eternal life proves its reality by its ethical working (I. John iii. 14). To be born of God is to do no sin (I. John iii. 9: *cf.* also v. 10). In symbolic language, to have fellowship with God is described as walking in the light (compare I. John i. 6, 7). Or again, in another figure, the end of union with Christ is fruit-bearing (John xv. 1–16). To sum up, in whatever form John represents salvation, its ethical character and working are clearly expressed and forcibly emphasised. We have, then, a more unified conception of salvation than the Pauline, whose great fundamental antitheses are resolved into mere aspects of a single idea. John has, in fact, while adopting many of the more developed ideas of Paul, in his general scheme preserved the lines of the simpler presentation of Jesus, from whom comes his fundamental conception of eternal life. In this way the Gospel of John proclaims its real agreement with the Synoptic tradition, while at the same time manifesting its own specific difference, and showing evidence of the progress of Christian thought since the first proclamation of the Evangel by Jesus.

§ 3. THE JOHANNINE DOCTRINE OF MAN AND SIN

It will have been observed that John's conception of salvation is mainly positive, and prospective, like that of Jesus, which is, again, another point closely connecting the teaching of John with that of Jesus. The negative and retrospective side is, however, not wanting. Salvation means the forgiveness of sins, means cleansing from sin (I. John i. 7–9).

Though we have in the Johannine view a very practical recognition of sin in its manifold aspects, we have no such elaborated doctrine of sin as in Paul. Some of the statements on the subject sound like reminiscences of Paulinism; but appear isolated, and apart from their general setting in the Pauline view. Thus John says, "sin is lawlessness" (I. John iii. 4), though he has no doctrine of the law in the Pauline sense as the expression of the eternal will of God. The law in John is simply the Jewish law—"your law" (John viii. 17), which, indeed, bears witness to Jesus (John v. 39 f.), but is not viewed in its universal character as by Paul in Rom. vii. Conviction of sin is wrought, according to John, not by the law, but by the Spirit (John xvi. 8).

Another idea used by John more or less in agreement with Paul is that of "the flesh." Apart from the passages where the term is used simply in a non-theological sense of the material of the body, we have (John iii. 5, 6): "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." Here we might perhaps find no more than the idea of flesh as creaturely and weak in opposition to the Spirit, which is Divine; but the context, with its emphasis on the necessity of the new birth, demands rather the idea of the flesh as positively sinful. This becomes quite clear, when we see that the birth by water and the Spirit in John takes the place of baptism and repentance in the Synoptic Gospels; so that on an equation of the two equivalents, and a removal of the common term, the Johannine new birth by the Spirit appears as the equivalent of the Synoptic repentance, and is therefore a regeneration not merely from creaturely weakness, but from creaturely sinfulness. Still more clearly does the Pauline idea of the flesh appear in John i. 13, where we have the phrase, "the will of the flesh," used in opposition to the will of God; and finally in I. John ii. 16, where the actual Pauline expression, "the lust of the flesh" (Gal. v. 16), is used again in a similar opposition (compare v. 17).

The most characteristic idea in the Johannine doctrine of man and sin, however, is that of the "world." This, in the full sense in which John uses it, is peculiar to his writings. It has various shades of meaning. It begins with the notion, found in other Scriptures, of the world as a transitory and temporal creation, in opposition to what is Divine and eternal (I. John ii. 17). Then it is used of the world of humanity, which is the object of Divine love and pity (John iii. 16; I. John ii. 2). But since with the idea of what is transitory is connected that of what is sensuous and betrays man to sin; and since, with the idea of humanity is connected that of human sinfulness, these conceptions of the world just described easily pass over into what is the specially characteristic Johannine notion, viz. that of the world as the sum of all that is evil, and in opposition to God (I. John ii. 15). Thus we obtain the idea of a lust of the world (I. John ii. 17), which is parallel to that of the "lust of the flesh," previously mentioned; and we have such statements as that the whole world lieth in the evil one (I. John v. 19); while finally, the world appears as the whole of humanity outside the Church, as actuated by sin, and hostile to Christ and His people (I. John iii. 13). It is a power to be over-

come (I. John v. 4, 5), and which can only be overcome by faith in Christ. It is this doctrine of the world, which is the real equivalent in John of the Pauline doctrine of sin. Two further points, however, must be added, to complete the Johannine doctrine of the present subject. First, the devil, as embodying in one all the evil tendencies of the world, occupies a great place in the Johannine system (John viii. 44, xiv. 30; I. John iii. 8, 10). In the second place, those who are of the world are sometimes spoken of as "not of God," sometimes actually as "the children of the devil" (John viii. 44; I. John iii. 10). Here we have an even stronger parallel to the Pauline doctrine of the universal sinfulness of mankind apart from Christ. But just as Paul recognises, in spite of his general doctrine, the existence of some who do by nature the things of the law (Rom. ii.), so John finds in the sinful world some who are Christ's sheep, though not of the Jewish fold (John x. 16).

§ 4. THE REALISATION OF SALVATION BY GOD IN CHRIST

With John, as with Jesus, and as with Paul, the ground of salvation is the love of God. "God is love" (I. John iv. 8); the manifestation of this love is the

gift of Jesus Christ to save the world (John iii. 16). The dominant idea in the whole of the teaching of John is that of the revelation of God in Christ through the incarnation (John i. 1–18; I. John i. 1–4). The revelation is not limited, as by Paul, to the great crowning acts of the death and resurrection of Christ. On the contrary, John finds the revelation of God in the whole earthly life of Jesus, in which these acts take their places as elements in a larger whole. It is not so much with the risen Christ as with the earthly Christ that John is concerned; only his object is to interpret the earthly existence so as to show the Divine glory shining at every point through the veil of flesh (John i. 14). This is the central purpose of his Gospel. In Jesus of Nazareth the eternal Logos or essential Reason of God became incarnate. In His miracles the disciples saw the Divine glory (John ii. 11). His acts on earth are the acts of God; for He does nothing of Himself (John v. 19). Whoever has seen Him has seen the Father (John xiv. 9). "I and the Father," He says, "are one" (John x. 30).

It is, to use the language of systematic theology, on the Person rather than on the work of Christ that John concentrates attention. Salvation is in His Person,

through the influence of which men are brought into full communion with God. John expresses this in two chief ways. Jesus is the light of men. He is their life. The two ideas are closely connected. "The life was the light of men" (John i. 6). The ideas are rather aspects of a common idea, than separate in John's mind. It will, however, be convenient to distinguish them. As the light of men, Jesus communicates the true knowledge of God (John i. 18): as the life of men, He communicates to them the life of God (John x. 10). On the latter aspect John lays special emphasis. It is expressed again and again in different metaphors. Jesus is the bread of life (John vi. 35, 48). He is the true vine (John xv. 1). He gives the living water (John iv. 10). In the consideration of Jesus, both as the light and as the life, John emphasises His humanity (John i. 14). Apart from this there is no vision of God (John i. 18). Similarly, it is through the humanity of Jesus that the life of God is communicated to men. The bread of life is His flesh which He gives for the life of the world (John vi. 51), or with even stronger emphasis on the humanity: "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life" (John vi. 54).

While thus the chief emphasis is laid by John on the

Person of Jesus as mediating the Divine light and life, in subordination to this His work, including the acts of His ministry as well as His death, occupies an important place. Jesus reveals His glory by His miracles (John ii. 11). The words He speaks are spirit and life (John vi. 63). Finally, the death of Jesus is the manifestation of His love to His own (John x. 11–18, xv. 13). This is the characteristic Johannine interpretation of the death of Jesus. We have also the idea of Christ's death as a means whereby He attains to greater influence in the world, drawing men to Himself by the power of the cross (John xii. 23, 24, 32). Another conception strongly emphasised in John is that the death of Christ is a victory over the devil, and thus the destruction of the power of evil. Christ by His faithfulness unto death shows that Satan has nothing in Him, judges the world, and so enables His people likewise to overcome both the world and the devil (see John xii. 31, xiv. 30; and compare I John iii. 8, v. 4). Finally, there appears or is suggested in John several times the idea of Christ's death as a sacrifice for sin, never, however, with any great distinctness; nor does the conception connect itself very closely with the specifically Johannine cycle of ideas, as it does with the Pauline cycle. The most important passages

are I John i. 7, ii. 2. It is noticeable that the special forms of expression made use of connect themselves rather with Hebrews than with Paul.

§ 5. THE SUBJECTIVE APPROPRIATION OF SALVATION

As regards the subjective appropriation of salvation, in John as in Paul the value of faith is emphasised. The noun "faith" is, indeed, only found in the Johannine writings in a single passage (I. John v. 4); but the verb from the same Greek root, rendered in English "believe," is ubiquitous. The difference here between John and Paul is, however, more than one of language. "The Johannine 'faith' has its deepest roots, in common with the Pauline 'faith,' in the general Synoptic idea of faith in the sense of trust, and in its close relation to the idea of 'deliverance,' or of 'salvation.' Apart from this, however, the idea, so characteristically brought to a point in the Pauline epistles, tends in John again to its original, and signifies in the first place simply the trust with which one receives the word of any one—whether of God (John v. 24; I John v. 10), or of Jesus (John viii. 45), or

of the Scripture (John ii. 22), or of a prophet (John xii. 38; I. John iv. 1). The difference between the Synoptic and the Johannine conceptions of faith lies, however, in the difference of the world of ideas with which, in the Synoptics and John, faith is brought into connection. What is here most peculiar to John is the tendency almost to identify the object of faith with certain doctrines or cycles of ideas (compare John xi. 21: 'Believest thou this?'). Since, however, these cycles of ideas all revolve about the Person of Christ, in contrast to the Synoptics faith in John also enters into a special relation to Christ, the bearer of revelation. Jesus speaks from time to time of faith in His person (compare 'believe on the Son,' John iii. 16, 18, 36, xvi. 40; I. John v. 10), by which is intended the confident assertion that Jesus is the Son of God (John vi. 29), is sent of God (John xi. 42, xvii. 8, 21), or come from God (John xvi. 27, 30) that He derives from above (John viii. 23), is one with the Father (John xiv. 10, 11), that He is the all-decisive person in general (John viii. 24, xiii. 9). ('Believest thou that I am?') Faith is put simply 'in Him' (John vii. 5, xii. 42), in the sense of a recognition of what He claims to be. If with such formulæ is interchanged 'faith in the

Son of God' (John i. 12, ii. 23, iii. 18; I John v. 13), this happens because the entire content of faith lies in the name of Him on whom one believes. According to this, faith is not reposed in a person without any underlying basis, but on that which the name peculiarly belonging to the person says of Him, what it makes of Him. The faith so formulated signifies, accordingly, the conviction that Jesus is, according to His witness of Himself, the Son of God" (Holtzmann, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, ii. 484).

After this it is not surprising to find that in John, just as in the later Pauline epistles, the idea of knowledge receives great emphasis, and becomes almost as important in the appropriation of salvation as faith itself (compare especially John xvii. 3: "This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent"). This knowledge is indeed, as Titius says, always knowledge based on faith (*Glaubenserkenntniss*); all the same, the greater stress on knowledge that we find in the typical form of Paulinism cannot be mistaken. If now we have "we have believed and known" (John vi. 69; *cf.* x. 38), faith preceding knowledge; we have again "known and believed" (John xvii. 8; I. John iv. 16), knowledge preceding faith.

Finally, the mystical element which forms so great a part of the idea of faith in Paulinism does not appear in John under this rubric. John coins instead a terminology of his own, the key-note of which is the word "abide" (John xv. 1 f.). Union with Christ is expressed by the thought that Christ abides in us, and we in Him, and the ethical bearing of this union is strongly brought out, as we have already seen. Here, however, from the subjective side, what we have to observe is that this abiding in Christ is enjoined on the Christian, as the condition of Christ's abiding in Him, and of consequent fruit-bearing. We have, then, the complete equivalent of the Pauline idea that by faith we are united to Christ, and thus dead with Him to sin and alive to righteousness. Another way in which John expresses the same idea is that of eating and drinking the flesh and blood of Christ (John vi. 53–56), a form of speech which goes along with the figurative description of Christ as the bread of life. In this form of mysticism, however, it is not the ethical bearing, but rather the direct religious significance of union with Christ, that is brought out (John vi. 54, 58). In John vi. 56 it is noteworthy that this form of expression passes over into, and is identified with, the other of abiding in Christ.

INDEX

ANTHROPOLOGY, 21, 33, 63, 100 f
Atonement, 37, 73, 119. *See also* Sacrifice

BAPTISM, 29, 126, 145

DAY of Yahweh, 4, 7, 15
Death, 24, 100, 110, 152

EXPIATION, 12, 14, 119. *See* Sacrifice

FAITH, 49, 117, 127, 136, 139, 145, 153, 157, 161, 176
Fall (of Adam), 24, 39, 100
Flesh, 21 f, 101 f, 170
Forgiveness, 18, 58 f, 116

GOD, (idea of), 1, 5, 18, 42 f, 80 f
Good works, 140, 157
Grace, 115

JUDGMENT, 7, 15, 29, 34, 36, 83 f, 129, 142, 147, 158, 163 f
Justification, 16, 91 f, 115 f, 158

KINGDOM of God, 7, 15, 28 f, 44 f
Knowledge, 136, 178

LAW, 10, 106 f, 112 f, 132, 157, 169

MAN. *See* Anthropology
Merit, 38, 115
Messiah, 8, 31 f, 64 f, 78, 154
Millennium, 30, 155

PARUSIA, 78, 83 f, 140, 147, 160, 163 f
Punishment (of sins), 3, 6, 24, 56 f, 110 f

RECONCILIATION, 99, 116
Repentance, 50, 58 f, 79
Resurrection, 27, 29, 34, 84 f, 96, 154
Righteousness, 5, 51 f

SACRIFICE, 12 f, 17, 75, 119, 135, 144, 150, 175
Salvation, 1 f, 7, 8, 16, 18, 19, 20, 26, 36, 45 f, 78 f, 82 f, 131 f, 137 f, 141, 146 f, 154, 158, 160
Sheol, 25, 34, 142
Sin, 3 f, 5 f, 20, 38, 54 f, 99 f, 152, 158, 162 f, 169 f
Sonship, 48 f, 93, 167
Spirit, 18, 79, 91 f, 95 f, 133, 169 f

UNION with Christ, 91, 123 f, 167 f, 179

WORLD, 171

Printed by BALLANTYNE, HANSON & Co.
Edinburgh & London

Each Volume, Cloth, gilt, **2s. 6d.** *net; Limp Leather,* **3s. 6d.** *net. A neat Cloth-covered Box to contain the Thirteen Volumes in the New Testament is supplied gratis with each complete set. Price of box separately,* **2s.** *net. Any Volume sold separately.*

THE CENTURY BIBLE

(ANNOTATED)

Gen. Editor: PRIN. WALTER F. ADENEY, M.A., D.D.

PRESENTS in lucid form the results of the best modern scholarship. Though in pocket form, the volumes are equal in amount of matter to *substantial octavos*, the result being obtained by the use of thin and opaque paper. Each volume is an original and adequate Commentary.

The standpoint of the writers throughout is that of a frank recognition of the ascertained results of criticism united to a sympathetic perception of the value of the books under study, and in the spirit of Christian faith. In treatment the volumes are such as can be readily apprehended by readers who do not pretend to any special theological knowledge. But no difficulty is shirked, and every effort is made to elucidate the meaning of obscure passages.

LEADING FEATURES

(1) **Beautiful Pocket Volumes.** (2) **Authorised Version** in large type (in New Testament only). (3) **Revised Version** (by arrangement with the Oxford and Cambridge Universities), **with full commentary.** (4) **Introduction** and **Index** to each volume. (5) Each volume complete in itself, with map. (6) Printed at the Oxford Press on pure rag paper.

A FEW OUT OF INNUMERABLE TESTIMONIALS

Very Rev. Joseph Armitage Robinson, D.D., Dean of Westminster.—"The work is at once simple and scholarly in character."

Rev. A. M. Fairbairn, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.—"Let me thank you for your book on Hebrews. I have read the introduction with admiration, instruction, and enjoyment. It is excellent—lucid, cautious, well-constructed, and well-balanced."

Rev. John Watson ("**Ian Maclaren**"), Liverpool.—"The names of the editors is a pledge of accuracy and interest in the notes. Not the least useful feature is the index."

British Weekly.—"'The Century Bible' justifies its title. It touches the high-water mark of popularised Biblical scholarship and of book production. In every respect it may be spoken of in terms of unqualified praise. In small compass and beautiful form, the volumes contain the Revised Version, the Authorised Version, and admirably compact and intelligent notes. No more competent, authoritative, and illuminating commentaries can be desired than such as are here given us."

Family Churchman.—"There is probably no issue of the Word of God which commends itself so fully to the student of Scripture as does this handy and useful issue."

THE CENTURY BIBLE

*GENESIS, by the Rev. Prof. W. H. Bennett, Litt.D., D.D.
*EXODUS, by the Rev. Prof. W. H. Bennett, Litt.D., D.D.
LEVITICUS and NUMBERS, by the Rev. Prof. A. R. S. Kennedy, M.A., D.D.
*DEUTERONOMY and JOSHUA, by the Rev. Prof. H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., B.D.
*JUDGES and RUTH, by the Rev. G. W. Thatcher, M.A., B.D.
*I. and II. SAMUEL, by the Rev. Prof. A. R. S. Kennedy, M.A., D.D.
*I. and II. KINGS, by the Rev. Prof. Skinner, D.D.
*I. and II. CHRONICLES, by the Rev. W. Harvey-Jellie, M.A., B.D.
EZRA, NEHEMIAH, and ESTHER, by the Rev. Prof. T. Witton Davies, B.A., Ph.D.
*JOB, by Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., B.D.
*PSALMS (Vol. I.) I. to LXXII., by the Rev. Prof. Davison, M.A., D.D.
*PSALMS (Vol. II.) LXXIII. to END, by the Rev. Prof. T. Witton Davies, B.A., Ph.D.
PROVERBS, ECCLESIASTES, and SONG OF SOLOMON, by the Rev. Prof. G. Currie Martin, M.A., B.D.
*ISAIAH, by the Rev. Principal Whitehouse, M.A., D.D.
*ISAIAH XL.-LXIII., by the Rev. Principal Whitehouse, M.A., D.D.
JEREMIAH and LAMENTATIONS, by Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., B.D.
*EZEKIEL, by the Rev. Prof. W. F. Lofthouse, M.A.
DANIEL, by the Rev. Prof. R. H. Charles, D.D.
*MINOR PROPHETS: Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, by the Rev. R. F. Horton, M.A., D.D.
*MINOR PROPHETS: Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, Malachi, by the Rev. Canon Driver, Litt.D., D.D.
*1. MATTHEW, by the Rev. Prof. W. F. Slater, M.A.
*2. MARK, by the late Principal Salmond, D.D.
*3. LUKE, by Principal W. F. Adeney, M.A., D.D.
*4. JOHN, by the Rev. J. A. M'Clymont, D.D.
*5. ACTS, by the Rev. Prof. J. Vernon Bartlet, M.A., D.D.
*6. ROMANS, by the Rev. Prof. A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D.
*7. I. and II. CORINTHIANS, by Prof. J. Massie, M.A., D.D.
*8. EPHESIANS, COLOSSIANS, PHILEMON, PHILIPPIANS, by the Rev. Prof. G. Currie Martin, M.A., B.D.
*9. I. and II. THESSALONIANS, GALATIANS, by Principal W. F. Adeney, M.A., D.D.
*10. THE PASTORAL EPISTLES, by the Rev. R. F. Horton, MA., D.D.
*11. HEBREWS, by Prof. A. S. Peake, M.A., B.D.
*12. THE GENERAL EPISTLES, by the Rev. Prof. W. H. Bennett, Litt.D., D.D.
*13. REVELATION, by the Rev. C. Anderson Scott, M.A.

[*Those marked * are already published.*]

London: T. C. & E. C. JACK, 16 Henrietta Street
And Edinburgh

65834 234Q
Franks, Rev. R.S. F855

The N.T. doctrines of man, sin, and salvation

2/18 n 24 FEB 1938

234Q
F855

65834